ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA.

NEW IMPERIAL SERIES, VOL. X.

SOUTH-INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS

VOLUME II

TAMIL INSCRIPTIONS IN THE RAJARAJESVARA TEMPLE AT TANJAVUR AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS OF THE CHOLA, PALLAVA, PANDYA AND VIJAYANAGARA DYNASTIES.

PARTS I TO III

BY

E. HULTZSCH, PH.D.,
EPIGRAPHIST TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS (RETIRED).

PART IV

BY

THE LATE RAI BAHADUR V. VENKAYYA, M.A.,
GOVERNMENT EPIGRAPHIST FOR INDIA.

PART V WITH INTRODUCTION AND INDEX

BY

RAO SAHIB H. KRISHNA SASTRI, B.A.,
ASSISTANT ARCHÆOLOGICAL SUPERINTENDENT FOR EPIGRAPHY, SOUTHERN CIRCLE.

MADRAS:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS.
CALCUTTA: THACKER, SPINK & CO. BOMBAY: THACKER & CO. (LD.).
LONDON: LUZAC & CO.

PREFACE.

Inscriptions of Southern India were begun to be collected systematically by Professor Hultzsch from the latter part of 1886 when he was appointed Epigraphist to the Government of Madras. The publication of these documents with texts and translations was taken up simultaneously and the following fasciculi of *South-Indian Inscriptions* were issued between the years 1886 and 1903:—Volume I; Volume II—Parts i to iii; and Volume III—Parts i and ii. They include 321 records edited critically and supply all the material that may practically be found necessary for constructing the rough outlines of Chôḷa and Pallava history. In the year 1909, the late Mr. V. Venkayya, M.A., Rai Bahadur, Epigraphist to the Government of India, volunteered his services to continue the work of Professor Hultzsch and printed in Volume II, Part iv, such of the inscriptions of the Bṛihadîśvara temple at Tanjore, as had not been published already in Parts i to iii of that volume. Before issuing further volumes of *South-Indian Inscriptions* it is found necessary to complete Volumes II and III with an alphabetical index and a historical introduction. The latter, in the case of Volume II, had been already drawn up by Mr. Venkayya and appears under his signature. I have only added here and there some foot-notes to Mr. Venkayya's introduction, besides giving a complete index to the volume and the texts and translations of two Pallava grants which are expected to supplement materially, the information already supplied by the records of the family published in the earlier parts.

It will be found on perusal that Mr. Venkayya's introduction deals almost exclusively with the reign of Râjarâja I, though the volume includes many other records, *viz.*, 29 of Râjêndra-Chôḷa I, one of Râjêndradêva, one of Kulôttuṅga I, one of Vikrama-Chôḷa, three of a probable Pâṇḍya king Kôṉêriṉmaikoṇḍâṉ, two of the Vijayanagara kings Tirumalaidêva and Dêvarâya I, one of the Tanjore chief Achyutappa-Nâyaka and one of a certain Mallappa-Nâyaka of about the same period,—all coming from the Tanjore temple, and nine Pallava and Chôḷa inscriptions from other places. Any attempt at giving a full account of these kings will only swell the introduction which is already big. I, accordingly, reserve my remarks on them for future volumes of the *South-Indian Inscriptions* which will deal with Chôḷas (other than Râjarâja), Pallavas, Pâṇḍyas and the Vijayanagara kings.

Madras,
9*th October* 1916.

H. KRISHNA SASTRI.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

INSCRIPTIONS ON THE WALLS OF THE CENTRAL SHRINE.

	PAGE
INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—	
No. 1. On the north and west walls, upper tier	1
No. 2. On the west wall	14
No. 3. On the north wall, lower tier	21
No. 4. On the south wall, second tier	42
No. 5. On the north wall, upper tier	53
No. 6. On the south wall, second tier	68
INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔḶA I.—	
No. 7. On the south wall, second tier	77
No. 8. On the walls of the portico, second tier	84
No. 9. On the south wall, first tier	90
No. 10. Do. do.	93
No. 11. Do. do.	95
No. 12. Do. do.	97
No. 13. Do. do.	98
No. 14. Do. do.	99
No. 15. Do. do.	100
No. 16. Do. do.	101
No. 17. Do. do.	102
No. 18. Do. do.	103
No. 19. Do. do.	104
No. 20. Do. first and second tiers	105
INSCRIPTION OF KÔṈÊRIṈMAIKOṆḌÂṈ—	
No. 21. On the north wall, lower tier	109
No. 22. On the south wall, first and second tiers	112
INSCRIPTION OF TIRUMALAIDÊVA.—	
No. 23. On the south wall, first tier	117

PART II.

INSCRIPTIONS ON THE WALLS OF THE ENCLOSURE, THE CHAṆḌÊŚVARA AND THE BṚIHANNÂYAKÎ SHRINES.

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—	
No. 24. In the inner *gôpura*, on the left of the entrance	121
No. 25. Do. do.	125
No. 26. Do. on the right of the entrance	126
No. 27. Do. do.	131
No. 28. Do. do.	132
No. 29. On a pillar of the east enclosure, to the right of the *gôpura*	134
No. 30. On a pillar of the south enclosure	137
No. 31. On the north face of a pillar of the same enclosure	139
No. 32. On a pillar of the same enclosure	140
No. 33. On a niche of the same enclosure	141
No. 34. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure	142
No. 35. On a pillar of the same enclosure	146
No. 36. On the first niche of the west enclosure, first inscription	149
No. 37. Do. second inscription	150
No. 38. Do. third inscription	152

b

PAGE

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—*cont.*

No. 39. On two pillars of the west enclosure 161
No. 40. Do. do. 166
No 41. On a niche of the west enclosure 169
No. 42. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure 169
No. 43. On the base of the same enclosure 172
No. 44. On a pillar of the same enclosure 174
No. 45. On a niche of the same enclosure 177
No. 46. On two niches and two pillars of the same enclosure 178
No. 47. On a pillar of the same enclosure 190
No. 48. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure 193
No. 49. On a pillar of the north enclosure 198
No. 50. Do. do. 199
No. 51. On two niches and two pillars of the north enclosure 203
No. 52. On a pillar of the same enclosure 217
No. 53. Do. do. 218
No. 54. On the base of the north enclosure 220
No. 55. On a niche of the east enclosure 222
No. 56. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure 224

INSCRIPTION OF RÂJARÂJA OR OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔḶA I.—

No. 57. On the outside of the east enclosure 227

INSCRIPTION OF KULÔTTUṄGA I.—

No. 58. On the outside of the north enclosure 229

INSCRIPTION OF RÂJARÂJA I.—

No. 59. On the east, north and west walls of the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine 236

INSCRIPTION OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔḶA I.—

No. 60. On the south wall of the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine 245

INSCRIPTIONS OF KÔṈÊRINMAIKOṆḌÂṈ—

No. 61 On the west wall of the Bṛihannâyakî shrine 246

INSCRIPTION OF MALLAPPA-NÂYAKA—

No. 62. On the west wall of the Bṛihannâyakî shrine 247

PART III

ADDITIONAL INSCRIPTIONS IN THE TAÑJÂVÛR TEMPLE AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS.

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—

No. 63. On the outside of the north enclosure 249
No. 64. Do. do. 251
No. 65. Do. do. 252
No. 66. Do. do. 259
No. 67. Do. do. 303
No. 68. Do. do. 307
No. 69. On the outside of the east enclosure 312
No. 70. Do. do. 328
No. 71. On the east wall of the central shrine 338

INSCRIPTIONS OF THE PALLAVA DYNASTY—

No. 72. Cave inscription at Vallam 340
No. 73. Kâśâkuḍi plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla 342
No. 74. Udayêndiram plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla 361

INSCRIPTIONS OF PARÂNTAKA I.—

No. 75. On a pillar at Uyyakkoṇḍâṉ-Tirumalai 374
No. 76. Udayêndiram plates of Prithivîpati II. Hastimalla 375

PAGE

INSCRIPTIONS OF KULÔTTUṄGA I.—

No. 77. On the west base of the Anêkataṅgâpadam temple at Kâñchîpuram 390
No. 78. On the south base of the same temple 392

PART IV.

OTHER INSCRIPTIONS OF THE TAÑJÂVÛR TEMPLE.

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—

No. 79. On three pillars of the south enclosure 395
No. 80. On a pillar of the same enclosure 400
No. 81. Do. do. 401

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔḶA I.—

No. 82. On the base of the south enclosure 402
No. 83. Do. do. 404

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—

No. 84. On a pillar of the west enclosure 405
No. 85. Do. do. 407
No. 86. Do. do. 409
No. 87. Do. do. 411
No. 88. Do. do. 412
No. 89. On a niche of the west enclosure .. .. ,,
No. 90. In the second *gôpura*, left of entrance 413
No. 91. On the north wall of the central shrine, lower tier 415
No. 92. On the south wall, third tier 424
No. 93. Do. do. 428
No. 94. On the outside of the north enclosure 436
No. 95. Do. do. 458

INSCRIPTION OF RÂJARÂJA III.—

No. 96. In the second *gôpura* of the temple, right of entrance 498

INSCRIPTION OF ACHYUTAPPA-NÂYAKA.—

No. 97. In the second *gôpura* of the temple, right of entrance 497

PART V.

PALLAVA COPPER-PLATE GRANTS.—

No. 98. Vêlûrpâḷaiyam plates of Vijaya-Nandivarman (III) 501
No. 99. Taṇḍantôṭṭam plates of Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman 517

INDEX TO VOL. II 537

TITLE PAGE, PREFACE, TABLE OF CONTENTS, LIST OF PLATES AND ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA .. .. pp. i to xiii

INTRODUCTION .. .. pp. (1) to (41)

LIST OF PLATES.

I. The Tanjore temple .. .. Frontispiece
II. Inscription (No. 1) of Rajaraja.—First Section .. .. .. To face page 2
III. Inscription (No. 20) of Rajendra-Chola.—First tier .. .. ,, 106
IV. Do. do. Second tier .. .. ,, 108
V. Inscription of Tirumalaideva (No. 23) (now, opp. p. 248) .. .. ,, 118
VI. View of the Tanjore temple from the Sivaganga tank and the large Nandi in the same temple .. .. .. ,, 121
VII. Inscription of Rajaraja (No. 29) .. .. ,, 136
VIII. Inscription of Konerinmaikondan (No. 61) .. .. .. ,, 246
IX. Kailasanatha Inscription of Rajasimha .. Supplementary to Vol. I, No. 24 ,, 249
X. Early Pallava stone inscriptions .. ,, Nos. 1 to 17 and No. 34 ,, 340
XI. Kuram plates of Paramesvaravarman I. .. ,, No. 151 ,, 342
XII. Do. do. .. ,, ,, 344
XIII. Kasakudi plates of Nandivarman .. .. .. Between pages 348 and 349
XIV. Do. do. .. .. .. ,, 350 and 351
XV. Do. do. .. .. To face page 352
XVI. Udayendiram plates of Hastimalla .. .. .. Between pages 384 and 385
XVII. Velurpalaiyam plates of Vijaya-Nandivarman III .. .. ,, 508 and 509
XVIII. Tandantottam plates of Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman .. .. ,, 520 and 521

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

Page 8, paragraph 2.—In this and the following inscriptions of Râjarâja I in parts I to III, the phrase காந்தளூர் சாலை கலமறுத்த has to be translated "who was pleased to destroy the ships (*at*) Kândaḷûr-Śâlai" as in Part IV, p. 432.

Page 9, paragraph 18.—*For* kuṭa *read* kuḍam.

Page 10, paragraph 34.—*śinnam* has been interpreted to stand for the Sanskṛit *chihnam* 'emblem'; but from the enumeration which follows it seems to denote 'vessels'. In Telugu records it means a coin.

Page 10, paragraph 37.—*For* kuṭa *read* kuḍam.

Page 17, Translation, line 9.—*For* Seriyas *read* Śeriyas.

Page 17, paragraph 5.—*For* kuṭa *read* kuḍam.

Page 40, foot-note 1.—The pearl necklaces *indrachchhanda*, *vijayachchhanda* and *êkâvalli* (*êkâvali*) are mentioned in the *Arthaśâstra* of Kauṭilya (Chapter XI, page 87 of Mr. Sama Sastry's Translation, Bangalore, 1915); *śrîchchhanda*, *dêvachchhanda* and *kalâpachchhanda* were evidently other such ornaments of pearls.

Page 63, paragraph 13 }
Page 64, paragraph 15 } *For* "Kâḷâr and Piḍâriyâr" *read* Kâḷâ-Piḍâriyâr.

Page 65, paragraph 17.—சிறுமுன்னியூர் எரியில் நீர்கொத்துப்பள்ளவாயாக கிடந்த நிலமும் has been translated "the land used as a pit (*paḷḷavây*) which is dug (*for*) the water from the tank (*êri*) (*of the village*) of Śiṟu-Muṉṉiyûr". The proper rendering is perhaps "the land which had become a pit owing to the accumulation of the water from the tank (*of the village*) of Śiṟu-Muṉṉiyûr".

Page 67, paragraph 24, line 1.—*śâlâbhôga* here translated as "(*a village*) enjoyed by the (*royal*) palace" is found on further examination of inscriptions to mean "gift (of land) made in favour of a feeding house".

Page 67, paragraph 25, line 1.—(Also in text on p. 59), Vênelviḍugu may probably be a mistake for Veḍêlviḍugu (*i.e.*, Viḍêlviḍugu).

Page 68, last paragraph of the introduction to No. 6, line 12.—*Omit* the words "the shrine of".

Page 68, last line.—*For* pujârî *read* pûjâri.

Page 72, foot-note 1.—In place of this note *substitute* "*i.e.*, the king who died in the golden palace". The father of Râjarâja I and of Kundavaiyâr, was Sundara-Chôḷa who from inscriptions is known to have borne the surname Poṉmâḷigaittuñjiṉadêva.

Page 81, paragraph 3.—*For* nêriya *read* neriyana.

Page 92, paragraph 1, line 9 and in all following translations where this passage occurs.—*For* the crown of Sundara *read* the beautiful crown, as in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 233, foot-note 4.

Page 92, paragraph 2.—*For* "for feeding the god" *read* "for offering to the god." *Amudu* is here used in the general sense of offering.

Page 94, foot-note 4.—*For* Pôlûr *read* Pôḷûr.

Page 108.—Takkaṇalâḍam which has been taken as the equivalent of Dakshiṇa-Lâṭa has perhaps, more correctly, to be identified with Dakshiṇa-Râḍhâ, the Southern Bengal country; see R. D. Bannerji's Pâlas of Bengal in *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 71.

Page 109, line 11.—" Vijayam of great fame " has probably to be corrected into " Śrî-Vishaya"; see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 231.

Page 109, line 11.—Uttiralâḍam has evidently to be interpreted as Uttara-Râḍhâ and not as Uttara-Lâṭa ; see additions against page 108, above.

Page 112, Introduction to No. 22, line 3.—*For* Suṅgandavirtta *read* Śuṅgandavirtta.

Page 112, Translation, paragraph 3, lines 8 and 9.—*For* " (*in*) the flower-garden (*nandavanam*) (*called after*) Geṅgaikoṇḍa-Śôraṉ which forms part of Karundiṭṭaikuḍi " *read* " (*in*) the flower-garden (*nandavanam*) (*in the village of*) Geṅgaikoṇḍa-Śôraṉ which forms part of Karundiṭṭaikuḍi ".

Page 115, Translation, paragraph, lines 14 and 15.—*For* "and of the boundary of the sacred flower-garden (*called after*) Geṅgaikoṇḍa-Śôraṉ which forms part of Karundiṭṭaikuḍi " *read* " and of the boundary of the sacred flower-garden (*in the village of*) Geṅgaikoṇḍa-Śôraṉ which forms part of Karundittaikuḍi ". In this and in the previous instance, the existing translation seems to have been arrived at by taking Geṅgaikoṇḍa-Śôraṉ along with *tirunandavanam* which follows it ; but it will be more appropriate to read Geṅgaikoṇḍa-Śôraṉ with what precedes. In this case, the expression *Karundiṭṭaikuḍi âṉa Geṅgaikoṇḍa-Śôraṉ* would be similar to *Karundiṭṭaikuḍi âṉa Śuṅgandavirtta-Śôranallûr* and *Karundiṭṭaikuḍi âṉa Kulôttuṅga-Śôranallûr* which occur in text-lines 3 and 4 of inscription No. 22. The particle *âṉa* which usually means " *alias* " seems to be used here in the sense " forming part of ". This usage of it is quite unusual and deserves to be noted.

Page 115, Translation, line 10.—*Insert* the word "Brâhmaṇa" before " village (*agaram*) ".

Page 117, Introduction to No. 23.—*For* " Timma, the founder of the second dynasty " *read* " Timma, the elder brother of the Sâḷuva usurper Nṛisiṁharâya "; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, p. 77, foot-note 2.

Page 117, line 9 from top.—*oru-pû* and *kaḍai-pû* are translated by " single flowers" and " flowers for the market ". The terms are applied in a technical sense to certain crops of lands growing paddy ; *cf. iru-pû âṟu-pâychchal-nilaṉ* in text-line 2 and *oru-pû-nilaṉ* in text line 3 on page 296 of *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX.

Page 117, foot-note 9.—After *Epigraphia Indica* insert Vol. I.

Page 118, Translation, line 7.—" *Vâriyaṉ* the *Kâraṇattâṉ* " has evidently to be changed into the " the headman of the village committee (*vâriyam*) " ; see *Epigraphical Report* for 1913, Part II, paragraph 23. The word *kâraṇattâṉ* may be compared with *kâraṇavaṉ* now current in Malabar. *Avadâvagakkaṇai* and *Râjasapakkaṉai* in text l. 6 f. have perhaps to be read *Avadaravaṟttaṉai* and *Râjasavattaṉai*.

Page 119, line 1.—*For* Teṉalûr *read* Teṉ-Alûr.

,, paragraph 3.—அளவுக்கு is translated by the phrase " to the extent to which they are granted ". Perhaps it has to be taken in the sense " *because* (*we have*) remitted ", etc.

,, foot-note 4.—After *Epigraphia Indica* insert Vol. I, and *for* 40 *read* 42.

Page 124, line 17.—*For* citizens *read* merchants.

,, ,, 18.—*For* within the limits of *read* outside ; see p. 446, note 2.

Page 138, Translation, paragraph 4.—*For* one pedestal (*surmounted by*) a lotus *read* one lotus(-shaped) pedestal.

Page 145, note 5.—*Insert* naṅganai *after* word.

Page 169, Introduction to No. 42, line 2.—*For* line *read* lines.
Page 171, Translation, paragraph 5.—*For* aurcola *read* aureola.
Page 174, paragraph 7.—*For* Siva *read* Śiva.
Page 223, note 1.—*Before* Perundaṉattu-Valaṅgai *add* Niyâyam.
Page 230, line 30 } *For* Kêrala *read* Kêraḷa.
Page 231, line 10 }
Page 242, line 1.—*For* diadem (*vîrapaṭṭam*) *read* front plate, as on p. 166.
Page 243, line 5.—For *karañu* read *karañju.*
Page 252, line 7.—*For* Kêra [ḷa-Vî°] *read* Kô[ṉ-Vî°] and correct the text accordingly on p. 251.
Pages 283, 295, 296 and 299.—*For* the word "temple" coming after Brahmakuṭṭam *read* quarter.
Page 300, paragraph 465.—*For* god *read* king.
Page 301, paragraph 472.—*For* Śembaṅguḍai *read* Śembaṅguḍi.
,, ,, 474.—*For* Kaḍaikkuḍai *read* Kaḍaikkuḍi.
,, ,, 476.—*For* Kîṟkkuḍai *read* Kîṟkkuḍi.
,, ,, 478.—*For* Mâṅguḍai *read* Mâṅguḍi.
Page 311, line 22.—*For* Siṁhalas *read* Siṁhaḷas.
Page 311, last paragraph.—*For* the jewel among the inhabitants of the forest country *read* whose smile was of (*white*) lustre (*like*) the jasmine.
Page 312, line 14 from top.—The number marking foot-note 3 after Puduvuḍaiyâṉ Arayaṉ Uḍaiyâṉ must come after Uḍaiyâṉ Kallâlai in line 16.
Page 325, line 1.—*For* Vembaṟṟûr *read* Vêmbaṟṟûr.
Page 333, paragraph 14.—The village whose other name was Abhimânabhûshaṇa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam was evidently Śîtoṅgamaṅgalam. The large Leyden plates read Śrîtuṅgamaṅgalam in line 154.
Page 336, paragraph 76.—*For* Emanallûr *read* Êmanallûr.
,, ,, 77.—*For* Vembaṟṟûr *read* Vêmbaṟṟûr.
Page 338, paragraph 109.—*For* Veśâlippâḍi *read* Vêśâlippâḍi.
Page 431, line 6, and page 342, line 4.—*For* Kaśâkûḍi *read* Kâśâkuḍi.
,, ,, line 8.—*For* Lalita *read* Laḷita.
Page 356, (verse 20).—*For* Pâṇḍya *read* Pâṇḍya.
Page 357, note 1.—*For* Anâthapiṇḍika *read* Anâthapiṇḍika.
Page 359, note 15.—*For* वेगवता *read* वेगवती.
Page 361, line 7.—"paradatti" evidently corresponds to "paraḍatti" of text line 63 of the Vêlûrpâḷaiyam plates, on page 509, and means an assembly (*parishad*).
Page 371, line 9.—*For* Nala *read* Naḷa.
Page 372, line 21.—*For* Kâlî *read* Kâḷî.
Page 376, line 37.—*For* Udyaśandiramaṅgalam *read* Udayaśandiramaṅgalam.
Page 435, section 49, line 3.—*For* *nâlam* read *taḷam* and correct the text accordingly on page 431. The latter as a variety of ruby occurs on p. 81.
Page 437, line 13.—Abhimânabhûshaṇa was a surname of Râjâditya the eldest son of Parântaka I; see *Archæological Survey Report* for 1911–12, Part I, p. 26.

INTRODUCTION.

As it is intended to write in the next volume of this series about the ancestors of Râjarâja I and the Chôḷas generally, it is enough here to put together all that is known about the life and reign of this king. The nature of the materials available to us precludes any details about his private life. The personal history of a sovereign who lived in the eleventh century and about whose times no contemporary historian has left us any information must consist mainly of surmises and inferences from the few facts that are known of his public life.

The original name of the king was Râjarâjakêsarivarman or Râjakêsarivarman Mummaḍiśôṛadêva which occurs in his earliest Tamil inscriptions. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates[1] call him Aruṇmoṛivarmaṉ. This name, in the slightly altered form Arumoṛidêva, occurs also in some of the Tamil records of his reign. The composer of the Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates remarks that at the birth of prince Aruṇmoṛivarmaṉ[2] "the wives of the serpent (Âdiśêsha who is supposed to carry the earth on his back) danced for joy in the belief that he would relieve their husband of the burden of bearing the earth." Râjakêsarivarman Mummaḍiśôṛa was the second son of the Chôḷa king Parântaka II *alias* Sundara-Chôḷa, who was also known as Poṉmâḷigaittuñjiṉadêva[3] "the king who died at the Golden Hall" (*i.e.*, the temple Chidambaram). According to the Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates, Sundara-Chôḷa's queen Vâṉavaṉmahâdêvî is stated to have committed *suttee*. Apparently the parents of Râjarâjadêva were spending their last days at Chidambaram as Śaiva devotees. It was evidently this aspect of their life that appealed most strongly to their daughter who set up images to each of them in the Tanjore temple and made an endowment for their worship (No. 6).

So far as we know Râjarâjadêva had an elder sister and an elder brother. The latter was called Âditya-Karikâla and all that is known of him is that he fought in his youth with Vîra-Pâṇḍya. In stone inscriptions he is known as "Parakêsarivarman, who took the head of Vîra-Pâṇḍya." The name of Râjarâja's elder sister was Kundavaiyâr. She had married a certain Vallavaraiyar Vandyadêvar (Nos. 2, 6, 7 and 8) about whom nothing more is known. It is evident that she spent her later life in Tanjore with her younger brother and that she

---

[1] These plates will shortly be edited in Vol. III of the *South-Indian Inscriptions.* An abstract of their contents is given in the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1906, Part II, paragraphs 11 to 18.

[2] From an inscription recently copied at Tiruvaḍandai (No. 274 of 1910) we gather that Râjarâja must have been born under the asterism Śatabhishaj in the month of Âvaṇi (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1911, Part II, paragraph 21). The twelve monthly festivals provided for, on the days of Śadayam (Śatabhishaj) in the Râjarâjêśvara temple (No. 26) were evidently also in honour of Râjarâja's birth-day. Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai in his notes on *Kaliṅgattu-Paraṇi*, Canto 8, stanza 24 (*Ind. Ant.* Vol. XIX, p. 331) mentions a Chôḷa king 'who established the *Chatayam-feast* in the Uthiya (Chêra-maṇḍala)'. The reference is evidently to king Râjarâja I and the *Chatayam-feast* was the one celebrated on his birth-day asterism, the Śadayam.

[3] No. 302 of 1908 refers itself to the reign of king Sundara-Chôḷa *alias* Poṉ[mâḷigaittuñjiṉadêva]. In a record of the twenty-seventh year of Râjarâja I (No. 116 of 1896), the ninth year of a Poṉmâḷigaittuñjiṉadêva is referred to. This king can be no other than Râjarâja's father Sundara-Chôḷa.

even survived him. We may suppose that Râjarâjadêva entertained a high regard for her and that she exercised considerable influence over him and contributed in no small degree to the formation of his character.[1] These were the surroundings under which the king was brought up. It will now be necessary to briefly review the history of the Chôḷas of Tanjore for a proper appreciation of the position which Râjarâja occupies in South-Indian history. The founder of the family was Vijayâlaya who established Tanjore as the capital of the dynasty. His son and successor, Âditya I conquered the Pallavas, and his son Parântaka I was continually fighting against the Pâṇḍyas and kept them effectually under control. Towards the end of his reign the Râshṭrakûṭas under Krishṇa III invaded the Tamil country, killed the Chôḷa prince Râjâditya and seized Toṇḍai-nâḍu which they seem to have ruled for about a quarter century. During this period the Chôḷas had to confine themselves to their hereditary dominions in the Trichinopoly and Tanjore districts. Âditya-Karikâla appears to have regained Toṇḍai-nâḍu, as inscriptions dated in his reign have been found in Ukkal and other villages of that province. Apparently on his death or on the death of his father—whichever was the later—the succession was disputed. The subjects besought Aruṇmoḻivarmaṉ, *i.e.*, Râjarâjadêva to become king, but he did not want the throne as long as his paternal uncle Madhurântaka Uttama-Chôḷa was fond of his country. Eventually Aruṇmoḻivarmaṉ was appointed heir-apparent while Madhurântaka "bore the burden of the earth". It looks as if the former was a minor when his father or elder brother died.

It is not necessary to give a detailed account of how the date of accession of Râjarâja-dêva has been arrived at. Professor Kielhorn has examined a number of dates of the king with astronomical details and has come to the conclusion that his accession took place between the 25th June and 25th July 985 A.D.

Turning to the military achievements of the king which are mentioned in thousands of his inscriptions found over a large part of the Madras Presidency, we find that until the 8th year of his reign = A.D. 994 he did not undertake any expedition. During this period he was probably engaged in recruiting an efficient army and otherwise preparing himself for the struggle which he must have thought he should undertake before the Chôḷa power and prestige could be restored.

In his first campaign the king is said to have destroyed a fleet in the port of KâIndaḷûr, which appears to have been situated in the dominions of the Chêra king. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates which furnish a lengthy account of Râjarâja's campaigns do not mention this item at all. They begin with the war against the Pâṇḍyas and report that Râjarâja seized the Pâṇḍya king Amarabhujaṅga and that the Chôḷa general captured the port of Viḻiñam. Perhaps Kâṇḍaḷûr or Kâṇḍaḷûr-Śâlai was near Viḻiñam. It is not unlikely that the Chôḷa king fought, on more than one occasion, against the Pâṇḍyas. The Chêras and Pâṇḍyas appear to have been allied together in their war against the Chôḷa king, for in the Tanjore inscriptions reference is frequently made to the conquest of the Chêra king and the Pâṇḍyas in Malai-nâḍu, *i.e.*, the West Coast (Nos. 1, 59, 91, etc.). Kâṇḍaḷûr-Śâlai which is stated to belong to the Chêra king in later inscriptions was probably held by the Pâṇḍyas when it was attacked by Râjarâja.

Before his 14th year = A.D. 998–99, Râjarâjadêva conquered Vêṅgai-nâḍu, *i.e.*, the Eastern Chalukya territory, Gaṅgapâḍi and Nuḷambapâḍi which formed part of the present

---

[1] An article on this subject was contributed to the pages of the *Indian Review*, under the heading "An imaginary conversation between Râjarâja and his elder sister Kundavai."

Mysore State, and Taḍigaipâḍi, the situation of which has not been made out satisfactorily.[1] According to Eastern Chalukya copper-plate grants, the kingdom of Vêṅgî was without a ruler about this time. The interregnum in the Vêṅgî country which preceded the reign of Śaktivarman is said to have lasted 27 years. On a previous occasion[2] I pointed out that this interregnum probably came to an end in A.D. 999, when the Chôḷas invaded Vêṅgî. Accordingly it may be presumed that Râjarâja restored order and peaceful government in Vêṅgî by placing Śaktivarman on the throne.

In the same period the Chôḷa king conquered Kuḍamalai-nâḍu. Professor Hultzsch has identified this country with Coorg,[3] and we have actually an inscription at the village of Mâlambi in Coorg[4] which belongs to the time of Râjarâja I and mentions his general Pañchavanmârâya. A place named Udagai is mentioned in connection with the conquest of the Pâṇḍyas (p. 250, note 3). The *Kaliṅgattu-Paraṇi* refers to the "storming of Udagai" in the verse which alludes to the reign of Râjarâja. The *Kulôttuṅga-Śôṛan-ulâ* also mentions the burning of Udagai. This was probably an important stronghold in the Pâṇḍya country which the Chôḷa king captured.[5] As the Pâṇḍyas were the natural enemies of the Chôḷas, Râjarâja seems to have gloried much in his victory over them. In the historical introductions of Tamil inscriptions where the above conquests are recorded it is stated that he was "always depriving the Śeriyas (*i.e.*, Pâṇḍyas) of their splendour." Having already overcome the Chêra king, probably while destroying the ships at Kândaḷûr or in the war against the Pâṇḍyas, Râjarâja assumed the title Mummuḍi-Chôḷa, *i.e.*, "the Chôḷa king who wears three crowns, *viz.*, the Chêra, Chôḷa and Pâṇḍya crowns" which occurs first in an inscription of the 14th year at Mêlpâḍi[6] in the North Arcot district. After his conquest of the Pâṇḍyas and other enemies, the king must have thought that his future was to be very bright and imagined that the goddess of the Great Earth had become his queen along with the goddess of Prosperity. It is in inscriptions of the 8th year of the king's reign that the usual historical introduction beginning with the words *tirumagaḷ* which was evidently composed after the conquest of the Pâṇḍyas, occurs for the first time. The *Vikkirama-Śôṛan-ulâ* evidently refers to the reign of Râjarâja when it mentions the conquest of Malai-nâḍu and

---

[1] A record of Râjarâja's 8th year at Tiruvaḍandai mentions these conquests. So also a few others of the 10th year begin with the historical introduction திருமகள் போல, *etc.* and register the above-named conquests of the king. Of the countries mentioned, Taḍigaipâḍi is located in the Mysore State. It is identical with the ancient district Daḍigavâḍi ruled over by Daḍiga a contemporary of one of the kings named Râchamalla of the Western Gaṅga genealogy (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, p. 22). Dr. Fleet writes a big note on Taḍigaipâḍi and identifies it with a part of Mysore including the present Kṛishṇarâjapêṭ, Nâgamaṅgala, Maṇḍya, Seringapatam and Maḷavaḷḷi taluks. He also thinks that possibly it may be identical with Daḍigamaṇḍala ruled over by the Western Gaṅga chief Daḍigarasa (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXX, p. 109 f). In the Hoskôṭe and Dêvanhaḷḷi taluks of the Bangalore district are a number of inscriptions which mention Daḍigavaṛi or Taḍigaivaṛi which in the Chôḷa period after Râjarâja bore the surname Vikkiramaśôṛa-maṇḍala and included within it the sub-division called Śeṇṇai-nâḍu.

[2] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, p. 349.

[3] Above, Vol. I, No. 40.

[4] Mr. Rice's *Coorg Inscriptions* (new edition), No. 46.

[5] The Kîṛûr inscription of Râjarâja's 27th year (No. 236 of 1902), which is partly mutilated, supplies a historical introduction of the king in Tamil poetry, different from the usual திருமகள் போல, etc., and mentions the king's conquest of Udagai in his campaign against Malai-nâḍu. As already stated the Pâṇḍya country must have also included Malai-nâḍu at the time of Râjarâja's conquest.

[6] Below, Vol. III, No. 19. The form Mummaḍi-Chôḷa (*not* Mummuḍi-Chôḷa) occurs in early inscriptions of the 3rd, 4th and 10th years. Consequently, the explanation of the name must be 'the thrice (powerful) Chôḷa' as in the similar Kanarese and Telugu epithets Mummaḍi-Bhîma, Nûrmaḍi-Taila, *etc.*

the killing of 18 princes in retaliation for the insult offered to an envoy.[1] The *Kulôttuṅga-Śôraṉ-ulâ* also refers to the same Chôḷa king who "cut off eighteen heads and set fire to Udagai." The conquest of Malai-nâḍu and the burning of Udagai refer evidently to the reign of Râjarâjadêva, but it does not appear when he cut off the heads of eighteen princes.

The king also subdued Kollam and Kaliṅgam. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates mention Râjarâja's invasion against the country created by Paraśurâma, who had taken a vow to destroy all the Kshatriyas. This country is described as inaccessible on account of the mountains and the ocean which surrounded it. It is doubtful if the composer of the Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates refers here to the conquest of Kollam or to the subjugation of the 12,000 old islands of the sea mentioned in some of the inscriptions of the 29th year of the king's reign. If it is neither, there must have been an invasion of Malabar which does not find a place in the introduction of the king's Tamil inscriptions.[2]

As regards the conquest of Kaliṅgam, it is not unlikely that this was effected by his son Râjêndra-Chôḷa. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates mention the defeat of an Ândhra king named Bhîma in describing the reign of Râjarâja. From the Raṇastipûṇḍi grant we know that Vimalâditya bore the surnames Mummaḍi-Bhîma and Birudaṅka-Bhîma.[3] Besides, two inscriptions[4] on the Mahêndragiri Hill in the Ganjam district which must have been included in Kaliṅga, record that a general of the Chôḷa king Râjêndra-Chôḷa defeated the Kulûta chief Vimalâditya, captured the Mahêndraparvata and caused a pillar of victory to be set up on the hill. From these it may be concluded that Râjarâja deputed his son Râjêndra-Chôḷa in his campaign against Kaliṅga. But the Chôḷa king had conquered Vêṅgî already and, as I have surmised, placed Śaktivarman on the throne, thus bringing the interregnum to a close. It is therefore unlikely that a member of Śaktivarman's family rebelled immediately after and had to be subdued. In the absence of evidence to the contrary I would suppose that the conquest of Kaliṅga by Râjarâja was earlier than the war of Râjêndra-Chôḷa's general with the Kulûta chief Vimalâditya and was intended to help Śaktivarman in consolidating his dominions after the interregnum. Some considerable time after the accession of Śaktivarman, there seems to have been fresh trouble in the Kaliṅga country. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates tell us that the Ândhra king had killed a certain Râjarâja and this seems to have been the cause of the war. Who this Râjarâja was we are not told. But he must have been some person in whom the Chôḷas were interested. This I take to be the occasion when the pillar of victory was set up on the Mahêndragiri Hill. We find the Vêṅgî king Vimalâditya at Tiruvaiyâṟu near Tanjore about A.D. 1013–14 making gifts to the Pañchanadêśvara temple.[5] Shortly before or after this date he must have married the Chôḷa princess Kundavai, daughter of Râjarâja and sister of Râjêndra-Chôḷa.

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXII, p. 142.

[2] No. 394 of 1911 refers to Râjarâja's conquests of Kollam, Kolladêśam and Koḍuṅgôḷûr (Cranganore): *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1912, Part II, paragraph 22.

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, p. 350.

[4] Nos. 396 and 397 of 1896.

[5] No. 215 of 1894. On the strength of this inscription it has been inferred that Râjêndra-Chôḷa took the Vêṅgî king captive to the Chôḷa country. But the king who was actually conquered by Râjêndra-Chôḷa (or by one of his Generals) is not clearly stated in the Mahêndragiri inscriptions to have been the Vêṅgî king Vimalâditya. The conquered chief on the other hand receives the epithet 'the lord of Kulûta.' It is again doubtful if at this time the Kaliṅga kingdom was subject to the rulers of Vêṅgî, although about a century later we know they were overlords of the whole country between Mannêru (in the Nellore district) and Mahêndra (in the Ganjam district). The political marriage between the Eastern Chalukya king Vimalâditya and the Chôḷa princess Kundavai must therefore have taken place quite independently of Râjêndra-Chôḷa's conquest of Kaliṅga.

Râjarâja must have simultaneously directed his arms against Ceylon. The king is said to have undertaken this expedition in order that "the eight quarters might praise him". This phrase occurs in the earlier inscriptions, but in later ones the personal appearance of the Singhalese seems to receive an uncomplimentary remark (*e.g.*, in Nos. 4 and 65). We have at Padaviya in Ceylon a Tamil inscription of the 27th year of Râjarâjadêva corresponding to A.D. 1011–12 A.D. Several villages in Ceylon were granted by Râjarâja to the Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore and had to remit their assessment to the temple in the shape of money, grain or *iluppaipâl* (No. 92). These facts show that the subjugation of the island by the Chôḻa king was complete[1]. According to the *Mahâvaṁsa* (Chapter LV) Mahinda V ascended the throne in A.D. 1001. The trouble in Ceylon began in A.D. 1012 when the king was unable to maintain his army and all the men of Kêraḷa in his service went up to the palace and demanded their wages. Then the *Mahâvaṁsa* describes events in Ceylon which took place in A.D. 1037. According to Tamil inscriptions these must have happened about A.D. 1016. The *Mahâvaṁsa* does not mention the invasion of Ceylon during the reign of Râjarâja unless it be the expedition by Vallabha-Chôḻa during the reign of Mahinda IV (A.D. 975-991)[2]. Thus there is no doubt that there is some mistake in the Chronology of the *Mahâvaṁsa*. Then comes a period of three years in the life of Râjarâjadêva about which we get no information from his inscriptions which are mainly concerned with his military exploits. This is the interval between the 18th[3] and the 21st years corresponding to A.D. 1002 and 1005 respectively. It was evidently during this time that the king received the title Śrî-Râjarâja which occurs first in inscriptions of the 19th year (= A.D. 1003). According to the *Koṅgudêśarâjâkkaḻ* the king made certain gifts to the Chidambaram temple in Śaka 926 = A.D. 1004. It is not impossible as will be shown later on, that the title Śrî-Râjarâja was conferred on him by the temple authorities at Chidambaram. Perhaps this was also the period when the king conceived the idea of building the temple at Tanjore and made arrangements for the operations to commence.

What the circumstances were that led to the war with the Western Chalukya Satyâśraya we are nowhere told. The Pallavas of Conjeeveram were constantly fighting with the Chalukyas of Bâdâmi. The Western Chalukyas of Kalyâṇi were descended from the latter and the Chôḻas occupied Toṇḍai-nâḍu, the Pallava territory. Besides this fact we know of no cause which could have brought about the war[4]. The conquest of Gaṅgapâḍi and Nurambapâḍi in the modern Mysore State must have brought them into direct contact with the Western Chalukyas. Besides, the rulers of these two conquered provinces were originally feudatories

---

[1] In the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, Part II, paragraph 21, it is stated that Îṛam (Ceylon) was called Mummaḍiśôḻa-maṇḍalam, after the well-known surname Mummaḍi-Chôḻa of Râjarâja. Other names of temples and towns in Ceylon called after Râjarâja are also referred to.

[2] Chapter LIV. Professor Hultzsch has clearly proved in his contributions to Singhalese Chronology (*J.R.A.S.* for July 1913, pp. 521 to 524) that Vallabha-Chôḻa is a gratuitous mistake, that there is a discrepancy of 23 years in the chronology supplied by the *Mahâvaṁsa* and that Râjarâja's invasion of Ceylon must have taken place between A.D. 1001 and 1004.

[3] A record of Râjarâja at Teṉkarai in the Madura district (No. 132 of 1910) calls the king Râjâśraya and adds the qualifying phrase "the conqueror of the world." This indicates that with the conquest of Ceylon which Râjarâja must have completed in his 17th year, he had actually conquered all enemies whose dominions he thought of acquiring.

[4] The Chôḻas belonged to the Solar and the Chalukyas to the Lunar race. The former were generally Śaivas and the latter were Vaishṇavas as they had the boar for their crest. Besides, the Chalukyas were also patrons of the Jainas.

of the Râshṭrakûṭas, the political predecessors of the Western Chalukyas in the Kanarese country. Both the Chôḷas and the Western Chalukyas were powerful and strong and must have been looking for an opportunity to measure their respective strength. Under these circumstances any slight cause would have been enough to provoke a quarrel.

The victory over Satyâśraya is mentioned in the Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu and the large Leyden plates and in one of the Tanjore inscriptions (No. 1). In the Tamil records of the king, the conquest of the seven and a half *lakshas* of Raṭṭapâḍi evidently refers to the same event. It must have taken place towards the end of the 21st (A.D. 1005) or beginning of the 22nd year (A.D. 1006), to judge from the references to the events in Tamil records. We have an independent confirmation of this expedition. According to the Hoṭṭûr inscription of Satyâśraya, dated in A.D. 1007–08, the Chôḷa king—here called Nûrmadi-Chôḷa and named Râjêndra—having collected a force numbering nine hundred thousand had pillaged the whole country, had slaughtered the women, the children and the Brahmans, and, taking the girls to wife, had destroyed their caste[1]. The Western Chalukya king claims to have put the Chôḷa to flight and acquired great stores of wealth and vehicles. The Chôḷa king evidently attached much importance to his victory over Satyâśraya, as he is said to have presented gold flowers to the Râjarâjêśvara temple on his return from the expedition.

The next period in the life of the king, *viz.*, the 23rd to the 29th year, was not characterized by any military exploits. The Chôḷa dominions probably enjoyed peace and the king apparently devoted his energies to the task of internal administration. The building of the Râjarâjêśvara temple in Tanjore and the multifarious endowments and gifts to it must have occupied a prominent place in the king's mind during these years.

We have reason to suppose that the king also carried out a revenue survey and settlement during the period.[2] The Tanjore inscriptions published in Part I of this volume bear ample testimony to the accuracy of the operations conducted by the king. Land as small in extent as $\frac{1}{52,428,800,000}$ of a *vêli* was measured and assessed to revenue. An inscription at Tiruviśalûr in the Tanjore district, dated in the 24th year of Râjarâja[3], refers to a revenue survey apparently carried out some time before the date of the inscription. The officer of Râjarâja who took an active part in the survey operations was perhaps the general (*sênâpati*) Kuravaṉ Ulagaḷandâṉ *alias* Râjarâja-mahârâjaṉ mentioned frequently in No. 95 below. His title Ulagaḷandâṉ, "one who measured the earth", might have been given to him in recognition of his services in connection with the survey operations. It was apparently as a result of this survey and settlement that the king issued his order, dated the 124th day of the 24th year to the following effect[4] :—

"The land of those landholders in villages of Brâhmaṇas, in villages of Vaikhânasas and in villages of Śramaṇas (*i.e.*, Jainas), in Śôṇâḍu, in the adjacent districts included in Śôṇâḍu, in Toṇḍai-nâḍu, and in Pâṇḍi-nâḍu *alias* Râjarâja-vaḷanâḍu, who have not paid, on

---

[1] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 433. An inscription from Ûṭṭattûr in the Trichinopoly district (No. 515 of 1912) of the 3rd year of Râjêndra-Chôḷa I mentions the fight with Satyâśraya and the death of a warrior on that occasion. Evidently it was prince Râjêndra-Chôḷa I that actually fought the battle with Satyâśraya.

[2] This survey appears to have been conducted in the 17th year of Râjarâja by which time, according to the Teṉkarai record, he had completed 'the conquest of the world'; see the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, Part II, paragraph 21.

[3] No. 44 of 1907.

[4] See below, Vol. III, No. 9.

the land owned by them, the taxes due from villages, along with the other inhabitants of those villages, for three years (of which) two are completed between the 16th and the 23rd years (of my reign) shall become the property of the village and shall be liable to be sold by the inhabitants of these villages to the exclusion of the (defaulting) landholders. Also (the land of) those who have not paid the taxes due from villages for three years (of which), two are completed, from the 24th year (of my reign) shall be liable to be sold by the inhabitants of those villages to the exclusion of the (defaulting) landholders." This order of the king was written by the royal Secretary Râjakêsarinallûr-Kiravaṉ and having been approved by the Chief Secretary Mummaḍi-Śôra-Brahmamârâyaṉ and by Mummaḍi-Śôra-Pôśaṉ, was engraved by order on the 143rd day of the 24th year. The 29th was apparently the last year of Râjarâja's reign. Even then his warlike spirit does not seem to have abated; for, in that year an expedition was despatched against the twelve thousand islands.[1] Which group in the Indian Ocean was denoted by this name I am at present unable to decide.

Râjarâja bore several titles of which the following are the more important:—Mummaḍi or Mummuḍi-Chôḻa, Chôḻa-Arumoḻi, Râjâśraya, Nityavinôda, Śrî-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśêkhara. He seems to have assumed the title Jayaṅgoṇḍa-Chôḻa towards the end of his life. These titles of his, figure in territorial designations occurring in the Tanjore inscriptions and one is tempted to think that in the names Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇi-vaḷanâḍu, Pâṇḍyakulâśaṉi-vaḷanâḍu, Kêralântaka-vaḷanâḍu, Râjêndrasiṁha-vaḷanâḍu and Uyyakkoṇḍâr-vaḷanâḍu, Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇi, Pâṇḍyakulâśaṉi, Kêraḷântaka, Râjêndrasiṁha and Uyyakkoṇḍâr[2] were titles of Râjarâja.

Râjarâja indulged in a pretty large number of wives. Lôkamahâdêvî,[3] Chôḷamahâdêvî, Trailôkyamahâdêvî, Pañchavaṉmahâdêvî, Abhimâṉavallî, Ilâḍamâdêviyâr (Lâṭamahâdêvî) and Prithivîmahâdêvî are known from the Tanjore inscriptions[4]. Each of them set up a number of images in the Râjarâjêśvara temple and made gifts to them. Lôkamahâdêvî was probably the chief queen. She built the shrine called Uttara-Kailâsa in the Pañchanadêśvara temple at Tiruvaiyâṟu near Tanjore and made many valuable gifts to it. The shrine was in existence already in the 21st year of the king's reign and was then called Lôkamahâdêvîśvara after the queen[5]. Only one son and one daughter of the king are known, *viz.*, Râjêndra-Chôḷa I, whose accession took place one year before the death of Râjarâja, and Kundavâ or Kundavai, who married the Eastern Chalukya king Vimalâditya.[6] The respect which Râjarâja showed to his elder sister Kundavai throws an indirect light on his domestic life. She is spoken as "the

---

[1] This last military campaign was perhaps as successful as the others preceding it. Evidently Râjarâja performed the *tulâbhâra* ceremony, *i.e.*, "weighing one's self against (gold, pearls or other such costly material)" in this year in order to celebrate his victories. Queen-Lôkamahâdêvî also performed the *hêmagarbha*, passing her body through a golden cow (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1907, p. 75).

[2] The Uyyakkoṇḍâṉ channel which is an ancient irrigation work in the Trichinopoly district was probably constructed during his reign and called after him. Besides the name there is, however, nothing to connect Râjarâja with the channel. On the head sluice of the channel is a broken stone belonging to the 28th year of the Chôḷa king Kulôttuṅga III (A.D. 1205–06). Though the channel is not mentioned in it, the sluice is referred to (No. 72 of 1890).

[3] She is surnamed Dantiśakti-Viṭaṅki in the Tiruvalañjuḻi (No. 633 of 1902) and the Tiruvaiyâṟu inscriptions (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1895, p. 4).

[4] From a record at Tirukkaḷittaṭṭai (No. 301 of 1908) we learn that Vêmbaṉ Śîruḍaiyâr *alias* Mîṉavaṉ Mahâdêviyâr was another queen of Râjarâja. Prithivîmahâdêvî (in Tamil, Piridimâdêviyâr) is called by her other name Nakkaṉ Arumoḻi in an inscription from Uyyakkoṇḍâṉ Tirumalai (No. 455 of 1908).

[5] *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1895, p. 4.

[6] The Tiruvalañjuḻi inscription quoted above, also mentions a "middle-daughter" named Mâdêvaḍigaḷ. Evidently Kundavai was the youngest of Râjarâja's children.

venerable elder sister." In the sentence which the king himself is said to have uttered when ordering all the grants made to the temple to be engraved on stone, the place assigned to his elder sister is next to himself and the queens are mentioned after her (No. 1). During Râjarâja's reign the walls of the central shrine seem to have been reserved for registering the king's grants. The gifts made by the queens and the Officers of State had to be recorded on the niches and pillars of the enclosure. But Kundavai's gifts were invariably engraved on the central shrine.

That part of Râjarâja's intellectual nature to which students of South-Indian history owe most is the desire on his part to record his military achievements in every one of his inscriptions and thus hand down to posterity some of the important events of his life. As far as we know at present Râjarâjadêva was the first king of Southern India to introduce this innovation into his inscriptions. Before his time powerful kings of the Pallava, Pâṇḍya and Chôḷa dynasties had reigned in the South, and some of them had made extensive conquests. But none of them seems to have thought of leaving a record on stone of his military achievements. For instance, we have many stone inscriptions in Southern India of the Chôḷa king Parântaka I, whose extensive conquests are well known. Of these the stone inscriptions refer only to the conquests of Madura. Even this item of information would probably be missing had it not been for the fact that the king bore the name of his grandfather Parakêsarivarman, and it was consequently necessary to add the epithet "conquerer of Madura" in order to avoid confusion. The idea of Râjarâjadêva to add a short account of his military achievements at the beginning of every one of his inscriptions was entirely his own. His action in this respect is all the more laudable because his successors evidently followed his example and have left us more or less complete records of their conquests. But for the historical introductions which are often found at the beginning of the Tamil inscriptions of Chôḷa kings the lithic records of the Tamil country would be of very little value, and consequently even the little advance that has been made in elucidating the history of Southern India would have been well nigh impossible. Early Tamil records are dated not in the Śaka or any other well known era but in the regnal year of the king to whose time the grants belong, and palæography is not always a very safe guide in South-Indian history. With the help of the names of contemporary kings of other dynasties mentioned in the historical introductions of the Tamil inscriptions, it has been possible to fix the approximate dates of most of the Chôḷa kings. Consequently, the service which Râjarâjadêva has rendered to epigraphists in introducing a brief account of his military achievements at the beginning of his stone inscriptions cannot be overestimated. The historical side of the king's intellectual nature is further manifested in the order which he issued to have all the grants made to the Râjarâjêśvara temple engraved on stone. That this order of the king was not due entirely to self-glorification is borne out by other records. For instance, an inscription of his reign found at Tirumalavâḍi in the Trichinopoly district[1] records an order of the king to the effect that the central shrine of the Vaidyanâtha temple at the place should be rebuilt and that, before pulling down the walls, the inscriptions engraved on them should be copied in a book. The records were subsequently re-engraved on the walls from the book after the rebuilding was finished.

The prominence given to the army from the conquest of the Pâṇḍyas down to the last year of the king's reign is significant, and shows the spirit with which he treated his soldiers. Evidently Râjarâjadêva gave his army its due share in the glory derived from his extensive

[1] No. 92 of 1895; *Annual Report*, on Epigraphy for 1895, p. 5.

conquests. It was evidently this same army that was called "the great warlike army" during the reign of his successor Râjêndra-Chôḷa I. The following regiments[1] are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions :—

1. Perundaṉattu Âṉaiyâṭkaḷ.
2. Paṇḍita-Śôṟa-terinda-villigaḷ.
3. Uttama-Śôṟa-terinda-Andaḷagattâḷâr.
4. Nigarili-Śôṟa-terinda-Uḍanilai-Kudiraichchêvagar.
5. Mummaḍi-Śôṟa-terinda-Âṉaippâgar.
6. Vîra-Śôṟa-Aṉukkar.
7. Parântaka-Koṅgavâḷâr.
8. Mummaḍi-Śôṟa-terinda-parivârattâr.
9. Kêraḷântaka-terinda-parivârattâr.
10. Mûlaparivâra-viṭṭêṟu *alias* Jananâtha-terinda-parivârattâr.
11. Śiṅgaḷântaka-terinda-parivârattâr.
12. Śiṟudaṉattu Vaḍugakkâlavar.
13. Valaṅgai-Paṟambaḍaigaḷilâr.
14. Perundaṉattu-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârappaḍaigaḷ.
15. Śiṟudaṉattu-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârappaḍaigaḷ.
16. Aṟagiya-Śôṟa-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
17. Aridurgalaṅghana-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
18. Chaṇḍaparâkrama-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
19. Iḷaiya-Râjarâja-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
20. Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇi-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
21. Mûrtavikramâbharaṇa-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
22. Nittavinôda-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
23. Râjakaṇṭhîrava-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
24. Râjarâja-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
25. Râjavinôda-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
26. Raṇamukha-Bhîma-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
27. Vikramâbharaṇa-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkârar.
28. Kêraḷântaka-vâśal-tirumeykâppâr.
29. Aṉukka-vâśal-tirumeykâppâr.
30. Parivârameykâppargaḷ.
31. Palavagai-Paṟampaḍaigaḷilâr.

In most of the foregoing names the first portion, viz. :—Paṇḍita-Śôṟa, Uttama-Śôṟa, Nigarili-Śôṟa, Mummaḍi-Śôṟa, Vîra-Śôṟa, Kêraḷântaka, Jananâtha, Śiṅgaḷântaka, Aṟagiya-Śôṟa, Aridurgalaṅghana, Chaṇḍaparâkrama,[2] Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇi, Mûrtavikramâbharaṇa, Nittavinôda, Râjakaṇṭhîrava, Râjarâja, Râjavinôda, Raṇamukha-Bhîma and Vikramâbharaṇa appear to be the surnames or titles of the king himself or of his son. That these regiments should have been called after the king or his son shows the attachment which the Chôḷa king bore towards his army. It may not be unreasonable to suppose that these royal names were prefixed to the designations of these regiments after they had distinguished themselves in

[1] It is doubtful if the community Râjarâjatteriñja-Kaikkôḷar mentioned in an inscription from Kônêrirâjapuram (No. 627 of 1909) was also connected with the military organisation of Râjarâja.

[2] Compare the titles Teṉṉaparâkramaṉ and Kîrtiparâkrama-Śôṟaṉ which occur in his Śêṉûr inscription; *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1912, Part II, paragraph 22.

some engagement or other. It is worthy of note that there are elephant troops, cavalry and foot-soldiers among these regiments. Thirteen of the above mentioned regiments belonged to the Valaṅgai-Vêḷaikkâra-ppaḍaigaḷ, *i.e.* the Vêḷaikkâra troops of the right hand. It is difficult to determine if this designation is based on the distinction between the right hand and left hand castes of Southern India. No mention of any left hand troops of this class is made in the Tanjore inscriptions though their existence may *prima facie* be assumed. At any rate the origin of the term is obscure and must be left to future research. The Vêḷakkâra troops are frequently mentioned in the *Mahâvaṁsa*. The term *vêḷakkâra* is explained by Mr. L. C. Wijesinha as "a body of mercenary troops employed by the Singhalese." They figure in the history of Ceylon towards the close of the 11th century A.D. during the reign of Vijayabâhu (A.D. 1065 to 1120). They were despatched on an expedition against the Chôḷa country but refused to proceed and rebelled. Eventually they were subdued by the Singhalese king. This mention does not throw much light either on the origin or on their history in the Chôḷa country at the beginning of the 11th century. It is possible they were no mercenaries in the Chôḷa country but regular soldiers. If a conjecture may be offered, I would say they were perhaps volunteers who enlisted when the occasion (*vêḷai*) for their services arose[1]. In later times when their services were not required in the Tamil country they probably migrated into Ceylon during the period of interregnum when there were frequent Chôḷa invasions against the island. Eventually they probably developed into mercenaries. It is interesting to note that eighteen of the musicians of the Râjarâjêśvara temple belonged originally to one or other of the foregoing regiments and no less than twelve of them were from the Vêḷaikkâra troops. Each of these twelve musicians got seventy-five *kalam* of paddy for his service in the temple. To some of these regiments, the management of certain minor shrines of the temple was entrusted and they were expected to provide for the requirements of the shrine. Others among them took money from the temple on interest which they agreed to pay in cash. We are not, however, told to what productive purpose they applied this money. At any rate all these transactions show that the king created in them an interest in the temple built by himself.

Among the officers of Râjarâja two generals are referred to in the Tanjore inscriptions, *viz.*—Kuravan̲ Ulagaḷandân̲ *alias* Râjarâja-Mahârâjan̲ and Krishnan̲-Râman̲ *alias* Mummaḍi-Śôṟa-Brahmamârâyan̲. The latter was the Chief Secretary (*Ôlai-nâyagan̲* or *Tirumandiravôlai-nâyagan̲*) from the 21st to the 24th year of the king's reign. Another such Secretary (*Tirumandiravôlai*) was Kâṟâyil Eḍuttapâdam, the headman of Râjakêsarinallûr. Amudan̲ Tîrttakaran̲, the headman of Viḷattûr, who drafted the Ân̲aimaṅgalam grant recorded in the large Leyden plates was also another Secretary; Îrâyiravan̲ Pallavayan̲ *alias* Mummaḍi-Śôṟa-Pôśan̲ must also have belonged to the secretariat staff as he signed both the Ân̲aimaṅgalam grant and the Ukkal inscription relating to revenue settlement. All of the above mentioned officers figure in the Tanjore inscriptions as donors. Krishnan̲-Râman̲ built at least two of the enclosing verandahs of the temple. Another officer who belonged to the secretariat was Vêḷân̲ Uttama-Śôṟan̲ *alias* Madurântaka Mûvêndavêḷân̲ who figures among the signatories to the original order of the king in the Ân̲aimaṅgalam charter. Other officers are also mentioned in the large Leyden plates, *viz.*:—Five persons who are described as *Karumamârâyum*, *i.e.*, "those who look after (the

[1] A Ceylon inscription of the time of Vijayabâhu I, gives some particulars about the Vêḷaikkâra community; see the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, Part II, paragraph 30.

king's) affairs." They were probably the king's executive officers. Four others who must have been Brâhmaṇas are described as *naḍuvirukkum* "those who are in the middle." These were perhaps arbitrators or judges. Two other officers are also mentioned, *viz.*, *puravuvari* and *varippottagam.* The former was apparently the office dealing with taxes due from revenue-free villages and the latter with the rent-roll of the Chôḷa dominions. Another important officer of the king was the magistrate (*adhikârin*) Udayadivâkaraṉ Tillaiyâḷi *alias* Râjarâja-Mûvêndavêḷâṉ of Kâñchivâyil who figures both in the large Leyden plates and in the Tanjore inscriptions. Still another important person was the temple manager Âdittaṉ Sûryaṉ *alias* Tennavaṉ Mûvêndavêḷâr, who was the headman of Poygai-nâḍu. He set up images of some of the sixty-three Śaiva devotees in the temple and made gifts to them. The king seems to have conferred the title Perundaram on the most important officers and men of note in his dominions. The title Perundaram is prefixed to Śirudanattu-paṉimakkaḷ, *i.e.*, "the servants of the Śirudanam" which seems to denote a class of officers. Perhaps the term was used to denote subordinate officials. One of the officers is described as Śirudanattu-Perundaram. He probably belonged to the class of subordinate officials but received the title Perundaram.[1]

The study of Râjarâja's inscriptions leaves on us the impression that he must have been an active man[2] and that he was probably successful in realizing some of the highe staims of his life. Like most men who devote a considerable portion of their earlier years in the active pursuit of cherished earthly aims, this Chôḷa king spent the later portion of his life in works of devotion. The Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore, which has evidently served as a model for a large number of other temples in Southern India, is a stupendous monument of the religious instinct of this sovereign. The enormous endowments in lands and gold made to the temple show that the king had one sole object in his later life, *viz.*, to leave no want of the temple unsupplied. Almost all the booty he acquired in wars he gave away to the temple. Utensils required for temple services; ornaments for the various images set up in the temple; villages for supplying the temple with the requisite amount of paddy; money for purchasing the various articles for temple use not omitting even camphor, cardamom seeds, *champaka*-buds and *khaskhas*-roots required for scenting the bathing water of the gods (No. 24); sheep, cows and buffaloes for supplying the ghee required for lamps; skilled musicians for singing the *Dêvâram* hymns; dancing girls; Brâhmaṇa servants for doing the menial work in the temple; accountants for writing the temple accounts; and temple treasurers, goldsmiths, carpenters, washermen, barbers, astrologers and watchmen were provided on a most liberal scale.[3] The systematic way in which the various endowments to the temple were made and the principles laid down for their proper administration bespeak

---

[1] 'Śirudanattu-kkaṇgâṇi-ttaṭṭâṉ of the lord Śrî-Râjarâjadêva' occurs in line 17 of the third section of No. 66. Śirudanattu may also mean 'of the youth' and the whole phrase may denote the goldsmith who was in the king's service when he was young.

[2] Râjarâja's military officers appear to have entertained a very high regard and even dread for the great disciplinarian. No. 64 and its continuation No. 95 which evidently refer to military operations that were going on perhaps towards the close of Râjarâja's reign, state how some of his officers of the rank of *Perundaram* and others who were judges and arbitrators vowed themselves to put up lamps in the Râjarâjêśvara temple, if no disgrace betook them at the hands of the king on their return from the war.

[3] This grand undertaking of Râjarâja must have created an admiration for him in the minds of his subjects. In later times the several incidents connected with the foundation of the Râjarâjêśvara temple and its equipment, appear by themselves to have become the theme of a popular story. For, in the 4th year of Râjêndradêva (*i.e.* A.D. 1055) we are told that provision was made for the performance of the drama *Râjarâjêśvara-Nâṭaka*, on one of the festive days in the temple (No. 67).

a genius for organisation which could not have been quite a characteristic feature of kings in general at the time. In spite of his sincere and deep-seated devotion to the Śaiva faith he was tolerant enough towards other religions. He permitted a feudatory of his to build a Buddhist shrine at Negapatam and granted the village of Âṉaimaṅgalam to it. This grant is registered on the large Leyden plates. In his order of the 24th year regarding revenue arrears, the villages of Śramaṇas (*i.e.* Jainas) are also included. This shows that the latter enjoyed equal privileges with Brâhmaṇas and Vaikhânasas.

The extent of Tanjore city during the reign of Râjarâja may be judged from the large number of big-streets, streets, quarters and bazaars mentioned in its inscriptions. The town proper as in the case of the large cities of the present day was not confined to the traditionary old limits (*uḷḷâlai*) but extended far beyond (*puṟambaḍi*). The following streets, bazaars and quarters of which several were named after the king or the princes of the family are mentioned (Nos. 94 and 95):—

(1) Abhimânabhûshaṇa-terinda-vêḷam.
(2) Âṉai-âṭkaḷ-teru.
(3) Âṉaikkaḍuvâr-teru.
(4) Arumoridêva-terinda-tirupparigalattâr-vêḷam.
(5) Brahmakuṭṭam.
(6) Gândharva-teru.
(7) Jayaṅgoṇḍaśôṟapperunderu.
(8) Koṅgavâḷâr-aṅgâḍi.
(9) Maḍaippaḷḷi-teru.
(10) Pâṇḍi-vêḷam.
(11) Paṉmaiyâr-teru.
(12) Pañchavaṉmâdêviyâr-vêḷam *alias* Kaidavakaidava . . . . . vêḷam.
(13) Râjarâja-Brahmamahârâjaṉ-aṅgâḍi.
(14) Râjarâja-terinda-Pâṇḍi-tirumañjaṉattâr-vêḷam.
(15) Râjavidyâdharapperunderu.
(16) Raudramahâkâḷattu-maḍaiviḷâgam.
(17) Śâliyatteru.
(18) Śivadâsanśôlai *alias* Râjarâja-Brahmamahârâjaṉ-paḍaivîḍu.
(19) Śûraśikhâmaṇipperunderu.
(20) Tribhuvanamahâdêvippêraṅgâḍi.
(21) Uttamaśîliyâr-vêḷam.
(22) Uyyakkoṇḍâṉ-terinda-tirumañjaṉattâr-vêḷam.
(23) Vâṉavaṉmâdêvipperunderu.
(24) Villigaḷ-teru.
(25) Vîraśôṟapperunderu.

The exact date of the building of the Tanjore temple is a question that deserves some attention. Stone temples were apparently not quite common in the time of Râjarâja. This is shown by the use of the word *tirukkaṟṟaḷi*, *i.e.* "the stone temple" in the order of the king to have all the gifts engraved on stone. The difficulties also of procuring stones for such a big building must have been very great, particularly as there was no hill in or very near Tanjore which could have supplied the requisite quantity. Such a monument as the Tanjore temple would take several years to build even with all the inventions of modern engineering. But at the time of which we are speaking mechanical appliances must have

been in a primitive state and hence the time taken to finish the building must have been much longer. Therefore we shall only try to fix when the building was probably begun and when it came to a close. We have some reason to suppose that the period between the 18th and the 21st year of the king's reign was not occupied with any wars. This was probably the time when the titles Śrî-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśêkhara were conferred on him as suggested already. The name Śrî-Râjarâja occurs first in an inscription of the 19th year of his reign. If, as is not unlikely, the name Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara was given to the temple in order to perpetuate the *biruda* Śrî-Râjarâja the king could not have conceived the idea of constructing the temple before the 19th year. The temple must have existed in some form or other in the 21st - 22nd year (= A.D. 1005–1006); because it was during this year that the king's expedition against Satyâśraya was undertaken, and on his return from this conquest Râjarâja is said to have presented some gold flowers to the temple. The whole structure, however, could not have been ready by that time. A very large number of gifts are stated to have been made between the 23rd and 29th years. The 23rd year was probably chosen because the building of the temple had in that year reached an advanced stage. Thus it appears that the construction of the temple began in the 19th year and that a considerable portion of it was completed by the 23rd year. On the 275th day of the 25th year the king presented a copper-pot to be placed on the pinnacle of the central shrine. We may conclude from this that the topmost portion of the central shrine must have been ready by that time; for, so far as the central shrine was concerned, the fixing of the copper-pot on the pinnacle would have been the last thing to be done.

A considerable part of the enclosure of the temple was, by order of the king, built by a Brâhmaṇa named Kṛishṇan Râman who was a military officer. This fact is engraved twice on the south enclosure and once on the west enclosure. From this repetition we may conclude that these two enclosures were built at different times by the king's general. There is no such inscription on any part of the north or east enclosure, and it is not impossible that they were built by the king himself. The *gôpura* of the east enclosure and the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine must have been built before the conquest of the 12,000 islands by the king in the 29th year of his reign.[1]

The circumstances which led to the building of the Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara temple may now be examined. In the *Dêvâram* hymns, the *Tiruviśaippâ* and the *Periyapurâṇam*, the first place among Śaiva shrines is assigned to the Naṭarâja temple at Chidambaram which is designated *kôyil*, *i.e.*, "the temple". The name Âḍavallâṉ "one who is able to dance" which was given to one of the chief images[2] in the Râjarâjêśvara temple is derived from

[1] It is particularly noteworthy that unlike other Chôḷa temples of the south, the Bṛihadîśvara temple at Tanjore was built completely with its necessary adjuncts in the time of Râjarâja himself, the founder of that temple, "on a well-defined and stately plan which was preserved in till its completion" (Tanjore District *Gazetteer*, Volume I, page 270). The small temple of Subrahmaṇya within the courtyard of the temple is not referred to in the inscriptions though the adjoining Chaṇḍêśvara shrine is. Consequently, it seems to have been a later addition (See Fergusson's *Indian Architecture*, Vol. I., p. 365). The Bṛihannâyakî temple also in the courtyard, was constructed in the second year of a certain Kôṉêrinmaikoṇḍâṉ, probably a Pâṇḍya king of the 13th century A.D (No. 61). The Dakshiṇâmûrti shrine abutting the south wall of the central shrine has been already suggested to have been a later addition. The Mahrâṭhî inscription on the inner wall of the south enclosure which is dated in Śaka 1723, Durmati (= A.D. 1801-02) states that the Mahrâṭha king Sarphôji-Mahârâja executed elaborate repairs to the shrines of Gaṇêśa, Subrahmaṇya, the Goddess (Bṛihannâyakî), Sabhâpati, Dakshiṇâmûrti and Chaṇḍêśvara, built one or two new *maṇḍapas*, and renovated the *prâkâra* walls, the temple kitchen and the flooring of the courtyard.

[2] Three of these are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions, viz., Âḍavallâṉ or Dakshiṇamêru-Viṭaṅkaṉ Tañjai-Viṭaṅkaṉ and Mahâmêru-Viṭaṅkaṉ.

that of the deity in the temple at Chidambaram and shows the importance attached to that temple during the time of which we are now speaking. From two of the Tanjore inscriptions (Nos. 65 and 66) it is evident that the names of the god as well as of the temple at Chidambaram and their various synonyms were very commonly borne by men and women during the time of Râjarâja.

Reference has already been made to the titles Śrî-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśêkhara. The second which means 'one (who has) the feet of Śiva as (his) crest' is a distinctly religious designation. Râjarâja being one of the names of Kubêra, the Hindu god of wealth and a friend of Śiva, the title Śrî-Râjarâja, "the glorious Kubêra" must have been conferred on him on account of his munificence. As it appears that both of these titles were conferred at one and the same time, it may be supposed that the king owed them to the authorities of the Chidambaram temple. Râjarâja's great grandfather Parântaka I. had distinguished himself by his devotion to that temple. He had either built or at least repaired the golden hall at the place. It was, therefore, quite natural that Râjarâja should try to imitate his famous ancestor in his devotion to the most important Śiva temple in Southern India. Practical as he appears to have been in everything he did, the king was not forgetful of his capital Tanjore when he wanted to demonstrate his devotion to the Śaiva religion, and accordingly built a temple there. In order to perpetuate the title Śrî-Râjarâja which he must have prized highly,[1] the temple was called Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara.

A study of the order in which the various inscriptions of the temple were engraved is not altogether unprofitable. It appears that the walls of the central shrine were reserved for recording royal gifts, including those of the king's elder sister about whom more will be said in the sequel. The inscription on the north wall (No. 1) which begins with the Sanskrit verse (*êtat viśva-nripa-śrêṇi, etc.*) was the first to be engraved and contains the order of Râjarâjadêva to have all the grants made by himself and others recorded on the walls of the central shrine. This order of the king is dated on the 20th day of the 26th year. The gifts which had actually been made prior to this date were, seven by the king himself and eleven by his elder sister as registered in No. 2. No earlier benefactions of any of the queens or other donors are known prior to this date. Accordingly when the king issued orders that the gifts made "by us, those made by our elder sister, those made by our wives and those made by other donors" should be engraved on stone, he himself intended to make in addition a large number of presents and expected that his queens and his officers would follow his example. Thus the order of the king referred more to future benefactions than to those which had actually been made prior to the date of the royal order. The earliest gift of which the date is definitely given is that of the copper-pot which was to be placed on the pinnacle of the central shrine. Though it was made on the 275th day of the 25th year, it is by mistake registered between a gift of the 34th day of the 26th year and another of the 104th day of the same year. Some at least of the numerous gifts which, in this inscription, are stated to have been made in the period from the 23rd to the 29th year of the king's reign may evidently have been anterior even to the date given at the beginning of the record. No. 2 likewise begins with the 310th day of the 25th year and registers gifts made by the elder sister of the king in that year and between the years 25

---

[1] A clear proof of his having highly valued these titles is found in No. 91 where the king is stated to have presented a large number of silver utensils to the temple, bearing the names Śrî-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśêkhara. The practice of engraving the name or title of the donor on vessels presented to a charitable institution, is still current.

and 29. It is apparent from this that no grants made could have been recorded on the temple walls prior to the 29th year of the king. This is also confirmed by the fact that all the inscriptions of Râjarâja in the Tanjore temple are either dated in the 29th year of the king or register gifts made until his 29th year.

One of the earliest inscriptions of Râjêndra-Chôḷa found in the temple is on the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine quite close to the north wall. During the times of Râjêndradêva, Kulôttuṅga I and Vikrama-Chôḷa, the north wall of the enclosure was chosen for recording grants. From these facts it may be concluded that the north wall was the most conspicuous portion of the temple. The gate on the north wall of the enclosure which is now practically closed must in ancient times have been considered as important as the *gôpura* on the east side. It is not unlikely that the royal palace was situated to the north of the temple,[1] and that the members of the royal family entered the temple by the north gate. At any rate, the foregoing facts show that the gate in the north wall of the enclosure was in ancient times as important as the *gôpura* on the east wall which is now most commonly used.

A few words about the importance of the Tanjore inscriptions for the history of Tamil philology may not be out of place here. In the first place the rules of *sandhi* are not uniformly observed. We have *ney amudu*, *âṛakku âga*, *kari amudu*, *paruppu amudu*, *uṛakku âga*, *uri âga* and *para ariśi*. Forms like *nâṟkkarañju*, *nâṟppattu* are not uncommon. The three forms *nâṛi uri*, *nâṛiyuri* and *nâḍuri* occur; also *tiṅgaḍôrum* and *tiṅgaṭṭiruvirâ*. These forms show that the rules were not unknown. Perhaps they were not commonly used in the popular dialect. The indiscriminate use of the two forms of dental *n* is also worthy of note *mûṉṟinâl*, *padinâṟiṉâl*, *iraṇḍinâl*, *aiñjinâl*, *âṟinâl*, *eṭṭiṉâl* and *pattinâl*. The addition of *y* after words ending in *e* and *ai* is common. Its use in the middle of a word occurs in *tirukkaiyk-kâṟai*, *aiyṅgarañju*, *vaiyttu* and other words.

The use of the word *kaḍava* as a principal verb is common in monumental Tamil and occurs also in the Tanjore inscriptions. In modern Tamil it is only an auxiliary verb. The history of this word is analogous to that of the English *ought*. The word *aṛivu*[2] appears to have narrowed in its meaning. It occurs in the Tanjore inscriptions in the sense of 'expenditure' while its modern meaning is 'waste'. The termination *âl* in the word *pattinâl* of the sentence திருப்பொற்பூ ஒன்றூ பொன் ஒன்பதின் கழஞ்செய் முக்காலெ நாலு மஞ்சாடியாக திருப்பொற்பூப் பத்தினாற் பொன் தொண்ணூற்று ஒன்பதின் கழஞ்சரை is used in the sense of the dative case, though *âl* is only an instrumental termination. According to the Tamil grammar *Naṉṉûl*, the instrumental termination *âl* is in rare cases used in the sense of *tôrum* and quotes the example *ûrâl oru kôyil*. This use of the termination *âl* is very common in the Tanjore inscriptions. In the phrase நாள் பதினாவினால் குடுத்த, *âl* is used practically as a locative termination. In கொயிலினுள்ளால் இருமடிசோழநின், *etc.* (No. 1, paragraph 1), கொயிலி-னுள்ளால் is used in the sense of கொயிலில். Again comparing the phrases காசின் வாய்த்திங்-கள் அரைக்கால் அக்கப்பொலிசை and காசு ஒன்றுக்குத் திங்கள் அரைக்கால் அக்கப்பலிசை both of which occur in the Tanjore inscriptions, we have to conclude that *vây* is practically a dative termination though it is generally treated as a locative ending. Phrases like பண்-

---

[1] No. 624 of 1902 from Tiruvalañjuṛi dated in the 21st year of Râjarâja mentions his palace at Tiruvallam (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1903, p. 3). It is not impossible that by this is meant the village Vallam 7 miles south-west of Tanjore, which is described as "a fortress of considerable strength and one of the great bulwarks of Tanjore."

[2] In early Kanarese inscriptions of about the 8th century A.D. *ûr-aṛivu* occurs in the sense of "destruction of the village (by enemies)."

டாரத்தில் பவழத்தில் கொத்த பவழம் ; பண்டாரத்துப் பவழத்தில் கொத்த பவழம், இரண்டாந தாரத்தில் முத்தில் and இரண்டாந்தாரத்து முத்தில் and கிளி ஒன்றில் கண்ணில் show that the locative was often used for the genitive. The use of the words *tirumêṉi* and *pratimâ* which are almost synonymous is interesting. The former is used with reference to an image of a god while the word *pratimâ* denotes "an image of a human being". The word *poliśai* or *poliśaiyûṭṭu* which occurs in the sense of "interest" is not quite common in modern Tamil. The word is however current in Malayâḷam. In modern Tamil it means "interest on grain lent for the season". Here, too, there has been a decided change in the meaning of the word. The Sanskrit phrase *chandrâdityavat* becomes *chandrâdityaval* in the first instance and then the final *l* becomes *r* according to a rule of Tamil grammar. This change of *t* into *l* is more frequent in Malayâḷam than Tamil. The Tamil words *taṟpuruḍa* (Sanskrit *tatpurusha*) and *taṟsama* (Sanskrit *tatsama*) are evidently formed on the same principle.

The rule of changing *l* into *r* is also applied in the case of a Tamil word ending in the consonant *l* combining with a purely Sanskrit word. Thus we have பள்ளியிற் லமெஹயார். The Sanskrit *padma* is always written *patma* in the Tanjore inscriptions; and the word *anyadêśa* occurs in the form *anâdêśa*, while *ratna* is sometimes written *ranna*. The hard consonant is used for the soft in *Bhriṁkîśa*, *ardhachantra*[1], *Liṁkapurâṇadêva* and *Patañcholidêva*. In *Kshêtrabâladêva* the reverse rule holds good. It is not apparent why the *k* is aspirated in *Trailôkhyamahâdêviyâr*. The use of the word *akkaṉ* for *akkai* deserves to be noted. *Tammai* is used for *tam-ammai* and *tamappaṉ* for "father". The latter occurs also in an earlier inscription at Śôṛapuram near Vellore.[2] The use of finite verbs (*viḷakkiṟṟu* and *kâṭṭiṟṟu*) as verbal nouns is not uncommon in modern Tamil (p. 208). The vulgar forms சொப்பு, எடுப்பிச்ச, மொழிஞ்சருள, பிடிச்சருளின, தைச்ச, எறிஞ்சு, வெட்டிச்சு, and ஐஞ்சு are worthy of note. அறிய உண்ணுதன is used for அறிய ஒண்ணுதன twice (pp. 78 and 85). The form விட்டன் occurs several times for வட்டம் or வட்டன். For the modern Tamil வெற்றிலை the Tanjore inscriptions invariably use the form வெள்ளிலை, which occurs also in the Ambâsamudram Vaṭṭeḻuttu inscription of Varaguṇa-Pâṇḍya.[3] Note also the use of ஓரணை for ஓரிணை.

The art of making ornaments of gold and precious stones must have reached a very advanced stage in the Chôḻa country about the beginning of the 11th century A.D. A large number of ornaments which are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions either go by other names at present or have no representatives in modern South-Indian jewel shops[4]. The nine gems are mentioned in one of the inscriptions (No. 93). Their names are: diamond[5]

---

[1] Compare also Chôḍa for Chôṛa in Telugu; தமிழ் + பொதியில் = தமிட்பொதியில்; *nâṛgâmuṇḍa* for *nâḍgâmuṇḍa* in Kanarese.

[2] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, p. 193, text-line 4.

[3] *Ibid.* Vol. IX, p. 91, text-line 59 f.

[4] One of the ornaments is called *Śôṉagachchiḍukkinkûḍu* (No. 93), the first component of which innicates the influence of the Jônakas (Greeks or Arabs) in Southern India in the 11th century A.D.

[5] The following varieties of diamonds are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions :—*maṭṭadârai*, *maṭṭadâraichchavakkam* and *maṭṭadâraichchappaḍi* (p. 78, paragraph 3 and p. 79, paragraph 9). Another classification of diamonds appears to have been *śappaḍi* (flat diamonds) and *uruḷai* (round diamonds) (p. 185, paragraph 48 and p. 195, paragraph 25). In paragraph 8 on p. 78 reference is made to pure diamonds (*vayirantûyana*) and to the two other varieties *pandasâram* and *śavakkam*. The flaws in diamonds are mentioned to be *poṟivu* (spots), *muṟivu* (cracks), *kâka-bindu* (black dots), *rakta-bindu* (red dots) and *vendana* (marks as of burning). *Paḷikkuvayiram* "crystal diamond" is mentioned on pp. 78, 87, 162 and 163, and *paḷiṅgu* "crystal" on pp. 87, 143, 162, 205, 206, 207, 225, 226 and 237. *Râjâvartam* is mentioned after *pavaṛam* in three cases (pp. 69, 143 and 179). Of *râjâvarta* (lapis lazuli) Monier Williams says 'it is a kind of diamond or other gem of an inferior quality,

(*vayiram*), sapphire (*nîlam*), pearl (*muttu*), topaz (*pushyarâga*), cinnamon-stone (*kômêdagam*), coral (*pavaṟam*), emerald (*pachchai* or *maratagam*), lapis lazuli (*vaiḍûrya*) and ruby (*mâṇikkam*). Four rings on each of which the foregoing nine jewels had been set were presented to the temple. The amount of gold, jewels and silver granted by the king is almost incredible. Several of the Tanjore inscriptions contain lists of gold ornaments set with pearls and other precious stones. The different parts of the ornaments are described in technical language and the number of jewels set on each, their total weight excluding threads and lac and the approximate cost of each ornament are registered in great detail.

The Tanjore inscriptions also throw some light on the economic condition of the people of the Chôḷa country about the beginning of the 11th century. The land assessment (*kâṇik-kaḍan*) was roughly one hundred *kalam* of paddy for each *vêli* of land. It would be interesting to compare this with the present rate of assessment. Paddy was sold at the rate of two *kalam* for each *kâśu* and three ewes could be purchased for one *kâśu*. The rate of interest was apparently $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It was actually $\frac{1}{8}$ *kâśu* per year for each *kâśu* or 3 *kuṟuṇi* of paddy for each *kâśu* per year. Table A at the end of this paragraph shows the grain value of some of the articles of daily consumption and table B the wages in kind. The latter includes learned professions as well as ordinary workmen. For Śivayôgins who had to attend the temple on certain festive occasions and who may be taken to represent the average middle-class men of the time, the allotment made for each meal is 1 *kuṟuṇi* and 2 *nâḻi* of paddy. Assuming that a middle-class man took two meals a day, the daily consumption for each man would be $2\frac{1}{2}$ *kuṟuṇi* of paddy per day. In table B the parasol-carrier may be taken as the type of the lowest class of manual labourers and each of them got 40 *kalam* of paddy per year and this would yield $1\frac{1}{3}$ *kuṟuṇi* of paddy for each day. We need not suppose that he was a full time workman of the temple. He would probably be earning extra wages during the time when his services were not required in the temple. It is worthy of note

---

said to come from the country of Virâṭa and regarded as a lucky possession though not esteemed as an ornament.' As regards rubies (*mâṇikkam*) the varieties are: *haḷahaḷam*, *haḷahaḷam* of superior quality (*haḷahaḷam guṇaviyana*), smooth rubies (*kômaḷam*), bluish rubies (*nîlagandhi*), unpolished rubies (*taḷam*), and *śaṭṭam*, all of which are mentioned on p. 79, paragraph 8. They were also divided into big rubies (*pariyana*) and small rubies (*neriyana*). The flaws of rubies are recorded as: cavities (*kuṛivu*), cuts (*prahara*), holes (*rejjam*), white specks (*laśuni*), *trâsa* and such as still adhered to the ore (*kaṟpaṟṟu*). As regards *potti*, which was either a kind of gem or part of a jewel, it has to be noted that it always occurs either with *paḷiṅgu* or *paḷikkuvayiram* (pp. 143, 163, 196, 205, 206, 207, 225, 226 and 237). Other gems *taruppu* (p. 205), *uppaḷanîlam* evidently a variety of sapphire (p. 204) and *nâli-gaṅgapâḍikkal* (p. 196) are also mentioned. The name of the last is interesting as it appears to have been originally at least obtained from Gaṅgapâḍi. Dr. Hultzsch thinks it may be the same as beryl. As regards pearls the following varieties were recognised: round pearls (*vaṭṭam*), roundish pearls (*anuvaṭṭam*), polished pearls (*oppumuttu*), small pearls (*kuṟumuttu*), *nimboḷam*, *payiṭṭam*, old pearls (*paṛamuttu*), *ambumudu*, *oruppuravaṉ*, *iraṭṭai*, *śappatti*, *śakkattu*, *kaṟaḍu*, *pâṇichchây*, *tôl-têyndana* and *tôliḍandana*. Their properties were *varai*, *karai*, *kuru*, *śuppiram*, *ippipaṟṟu*, *arâvina*, *śivandanîr*, *kuḷirnda-nîr* and *tiraṅgal*, which are also mentioned. The nine gems are referred to in the Tamil poem *Śilappadigâram* where the virtues and flaws of each of them are also given. Of diamonds the author mentions four flaws, *viz.*, *kâkapâdam*, *kaḷaṅgam*, *vindu* and *égai*, while the commentator refers to twelve flaws of diamonds, *viz.*, *śaraimalam*, *kîṟṟu*, *śambaḍi*, *piḷattal*, *tuḷai*, *kari*, *vindu*, *kâkapâdam*, *miruttu*, *kôḍiyillana*, *kôḍimuṟindana* and *târaimaṛuṅgina*. The five characteristics of diamonds are: eight faces (*palagai*), six angles (*kôḍi*), *dârai*, *śutti* and *tarâsa* and the four colours, the Brâhmaṇa "white", the Kshatriya "red", the Vaiśya "green" and the Śûdra "black". Consequently the virtues and flaws of diamonds were known in the Tamil country long before the time of Râjarâja. Varâhamihira (6th century A.D.) describes the characteristics of a diamond in the following verse:—

सर्वद्रव्याभेद्यं लघ्वम्भसि तरति रश्मिवत् स्निग्धम् ।
तडिदनलशक्रचापोपमं च वज्रं हितायोक्तम् ॥

that chillies are not mentioned where they may naturally be expected and cocoanuts seem to have been unknown at least in the vicinity of Tanjore if not in the Chôḷa country. The *teṅgu* [*maram*] occurs on p. 56, paragraph 13, and in the large Leyden plates (text-line 314) the donee is authorised to plant cocoanut trees. Though the cocoanut was known, perhaps it was not quite common and therefore it is not mentioned among the offerings presented to the temple. Dhal exchanged with paddy in the ratio of 1 to 3 and curds in the same proportion. Some of the other articles in Table B are also mentioned in two other inscriptions (Nos. 6 and 35). But their prices vary in the three. This difference must be due to the varying quality of the articles.

TABLE A.

ARTICLES of daily consumption and their exchange value at the beginning of the 11th century A.D.

Number.	Items.	Quantity.	Price.
1	Cardamom seeds	1 kuṟuṇi and 4 nâṛi	1 kâśu.
2	Champaka buds	1 padakku	1 kâśu.
3	Khaskhas roots	605 palam	1 kâśu.
4	Dhal	1 nâṛi, 3 uṛakku and 1 âṛâkku	5 nâṛi, 1 uri and 1 âṛâkku of paddy.
5	Pepper	1 âṛâkku and $1\frac{3}{4}$ śeviḍu	5 nâṛi, 1 uṛakku of paddy.
6	Mustard	1 âṛâkku and 1 śeviḍu	2 nâṛi and 1 uṛakku of paddy.
7	Cumin	$\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{3}{20}$, $\frac{3}{80}$ śeviḍu	1 nâṛi.
8	Sugar	3 palam	$1\frac{1}{2}$ kâśu.
9	Ghee	1 uṛakku, 1 âṛâkku, $3\frac{3}{4}$ śeviḍu	1 kuṟuṇi and 7 nâṛi of paddy.
10	Tamarind	8 palam	1 nâṛi of paddy.
11	Curds	3 nâṛi	1 kuṟuṇi, 1 nâṛi of paddy.
12	Gram	3 śeviḍu	1 uṛakku of paddy.
13	Plantains	18	5 nâṛi of paddy.
14	Salt	1 uṛakku and 1 âṛâkku	1 uṛakku and 1 âṛâkku of paddy.
15	Tender (plantain?) leaves	12	2 nâṛi of paddy.
16	Arecanuts and betel-leaves	{30 / 60}	4 nâṛi and 1 uṛakku of paddy.
17	Bark	1 kaśu	1 nâṛi of paddy.
18	Camphor	3 karañju	1 kâśu.
19	Pulse	1 nâṛi	3 nâṛi of paddy.

TABLE B.

WAGES in the Chôḷa country at the beginning of the 11th century A.D.

Number.	Nature of work.	Wages.
1	Brahmachârin, temple servant	2 kuṟuṇi of paddy per day and 4 kâśu per year.
2	Permanent temple servant	3 kuṟuṇi of paddy per day and 4 kâśu per year.
3	Garland-maker	2 kuṟuṇi of paddy per day and 5 kâśu per year.
4	Accountant	200 kalam of paddy per year.
5	Dancing girl	100 kalam of paddy per year.
6	Dancing master	2 shares (*i.e.*, 200 kalam of paddy per year).
7	Lute-player	$1\frac{3}{4}$ shares (*i.e.*, 175 kalam do.).
8	Musician who had to sing in Sanskrit	$1\frac{1}{2}$ shares (*i.e.*, 150 kalam do.).
9	Do. in Tamil	Do. do.).
10	Drummer	1 share (*i.e.*, 100 kalam of paddy per year).
11	Temple Accountant	2 shares (*i.e.*, 200 kalam do.).
12	Deputy Accountant	$\frac{3}{4}$ share (*i.e.*, 75 kalam do.).
13	Parasol-carrier	$\frac{8}{20}$ share (*i.e.*, 40 kalam do.).
14	Lamp-lighter	$\frac{1}{2}$ share (*i.e.*, 50 kalam do.).
15	Washerman	1 share (*i.e.*, 100 kalam do.).
16	Barber	$\frac{1}{2}$ share (*i.e.*, 50 kalam do.).
17	Tailor	1 share (*i.e.*, 100 kalam do.).
18	Jewel-stitcher	$1\frac{1}{2}$ shares (*i.e.*, 150 kalam do.).
19	Brazier	1 share (*i.e.*, 100 kalam do.).
20	Master Carpenter	$1\frac{1}{2}$ shares (*i.e.*, 150 kalam do.).
21	Ordinary Carpenter	$\frac{3}{4}$ share (*i.e.*, 75 kalam do.).
22	Goldsmith Superintendent	1 share (*i.e.*, 100 kalam do.).
23	*Tiruppadiyam* reciter	3 kuṟuṇi of paddy per day.

The following portions of villages were communal and as such free from assessment :— the village site, the village tank and its banks; the portion occupied by the artisans and the Pariahs; the burning ground; the irrigation channels; temples; the shrines of Aiyaṉ, Kâḍugâḷ, Durgaiyâr and Kâḷâ-Piḍâriyâr; the temple of Śêṭṭai (Jyêshṭhâ), the shrines of the Piḍâris Tiruvâl-uḍaiyâḷ, Kuduraivaṭṭam-uḍaiyâḷ, Puṉṉaitturai-naṅgai and Poduvagai-Ûruḍai-yâḷ; ponds in the middle of fields; flower-gardens; streams; the portion occupied by toddy-drawers; the portion occupied by washermen; the water-pond used by Pariahs; the portion occupied by the polluting castes; high roads; rivers; the sacred courts (*i.e.*, temples); the cremation ground of the Pariahs; the stone fence (for cattle); the stables (*koṭṭagâram*); the village threshing floor; grazing ground for calves; wells and cisterns.

A large number of villages in the Chôḷa country had *sabhâs* or regularly constituted village corporations which watched jealously over the internal affairs of the village. The Uttaramallûr inscriptions of Parântaka I published by me in the Director-General's Annual for 1904–05 lay down rules for the selection of members to the village committees which were apparently controlled by the village assemblies. We may presume that the same rules were in force in other village *sabhâs*. There were also villages where the villagers managed the business of the village without having been constituted into a regular corporation.[1] Whenever the village assemblies existed, their transactions must have been quite lively as there were periodical changes of members on these bodies. They seem to have been entrusted with civil and magisterial powers. In fact each village seems to have been a self-contained body jealously watching over its own interests as well as those of its members. The village assemblies generally managed temples and were trustees of public charities. A number of village assemblies are said to have received money on interest from the Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore. In all probability the money thus borrowed was utilised in bringing waste lands under cultivation. From the produce of these lands the interest on the money borrowed was paid. The money itself was apparently never returned. Village assemblies could alienate lands whenever the liabilities incurred by them could not be otherwise discharged.

The reign of a powerful king like Râjarâja could not have been without its effect on South-Indian literature. The traditions about the life of the sixty-three devotees of Śiva which were in later times embodied by the Tamil poet Śêkkiḻâr in his *Periyapurâṇam*[2] were already current at the time of which we are speaking. The Śaiva hymns of the Tiruppadi-yam were sung in the temple by 48 musicians accompanied by two drummers (No. 65). The king himself and one of his officers set up images of the most prominent of the Śaiva devotees and presented valuable ornaments to them. Râjarâja and his officers would thus have created a Śaiva revival even if it did not already exist.[3] It is, however, more probable that in setting up these images they were only representing the religious fervour of the

[1] See the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, p. 98, paragraph 23.

[2] It was in the time of the Chôḷa king Anapâya that Śêkkiḻâr is supposed to have compiled the *Periya-purâṇam*. The record at Tiruvârûr, partly published on page 153 of this volume and allied inscriptions from other places prove that this Anapâya could be no other than the Chôḷa king Kulôttuṅga-Chôḷa II (A.D. 1133 to at least 1148); see the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1912, Part II, paragraph 27.

[3] The great love entertained by Râjarâja for Śaivism must have been eagerly imbibed by his son Râjêndra-Chôḷa. The latter's spiritual teacher (*guru*) was Îśâna-Śiva-Paṇḍita the *Śaivâchârya* of the Tanjore temple. No. 20 also mentions the *Śaivâchârya* Sarva-Śiva-Paṇḍita and makes provision of paddy for him, his pupils and his pupils' pupils who were natives of Âryadêśa, Madhyadêśa and Gauḍadêśa. In Trilôchana-Śivâchârya's *Siddhântasârâvali* we are told that the Chôḷa king Râjêndra-Chôḷa brought many Śaiva teachers from the banks of the Ganges and settled them in the Chôḷa country.

people at large to whom the lives of the sixty-three devotees of Śiva must have been quite familiar even before the time of Râjarâja.

It has been supposed that Nambi-Âṇḍâr-Nambi was a contemporary of Râjarâja.[1] It is true his patron is said to have been a Chôḷa king named Râjarâja Abhaya-Kulaśêkhara. But there is a very serious difficulty in identifying this Râjarâja with the builder of the Tanjore temple. Among the poems which Nambi-Âṇḍâr-Nambi is said to have classified, is the *Tiruviśaippâ* which contains a hymn on the Gaṅgaikoṇḍa-Chôḷêśvara temple built evidently by Râjarâja's son Râjêndra-Chôḷa and called after his title Gaṅgaikoṇḍa-Chôḷa. The composer of the hymn himself must have lived after Râjarâja ; and Nambi-Âṇḍâr-Nambi who classifies it along with the sacred writings of the Tamil Śaivas, must certainly belong to a still later period.

The chief image of the Tanjore temple was called Âḍavallâṉ.[2] Another name of the same image was Dakshiṇamêru-Viḍaṅgaṉ. Âḍavallâṉ was also the name of a grain measure and of a weight for precious metals; while Dakshiṇamêru-Viḍaṅgaṉ was the standard used in weighing precious stones. These two names were also borne frequently by ordinary individuals. Âḍavallâṉ 'one who is able to dance' occurs as a name of the god at Chidambaram in the first hymn of the *Tiruviśaippâ* which was composed by Tirumâḷigaittêvar. The name Dakshiṇamêru-Viḍaṅgaṉ as applied to a god is easily explained with the help of a hymn of the *Tiruviśaippâ* where Mêru-Viḍaṅgaṉ occurs as a name of the god at Chidambaram. Mount Mêru consists of gold and is supposed to be situated to the north of Jambudvîpa. The temple at Chidambaram seems to have been looked upon as the Southern Mêru, as it contained a large amount of gold on the roof of its golden hall. Thus it seems to me that the two names of the most important image in the Tanjore temple are traceable to the *Tiruviśaippâ*. The names Eḍuttapâdam, Maṟalaich-chilambu and Nîraṇipavaṟakkuṉṟu which occur as the names of the temple women in the Tanjore inscriptions (No. 66) are also found in the *Tiruviśaippâ*. A number of other names which occur in the former are also found in the latter. I am inclined to think, therefore, that one or more of the authors of the *Tiruviśaippâ* must have flourished during the reign of Râjarâja. Karuvûrdêvar who composed the hymns on the Râjarâjêśvara and Gaṅgaikoṇḍa-chôḷêśvara temples must have lived after Râjarâja. Gaṇḍarâditya, another of the authors of the *Tiruviśaippâ*, has been identified with Gaṇḍarâditya, second son of Parântaka I. So little is known about this Gaṇḍarâditya that I am tempted to question this identification. It is true that in the hymn in question Gaṇḍarâditya calls himself 'king of Kôḻi' and 'lord of Tañjai.' But perhaps this means nothing more than that he belonged to the Chôḷa royal family.[3] Another of the authors of the *Tiruviśaippâ* is Nambi-Kâḍa-Nambi. A certain Nambi-Kâḍa-Nambi of the Âtrêya-*gôtra* is mentioned in an inscription of the 32nd year of the Chôḷa king Râjâdhirâjadêva.[4] In the light of the foregoing facts it may be concluded that only some of the authors of the *Tiruviśaippâ* flourished during the reign of Râjarâjadêva.

---

[1] *Christian College Magazine* for September 1896.

[2] See above, p. 13, note 2.

[3] A certain Madhurântakaṉ Gaṇḍarâdittaṉâr (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1907, Part II, paragraph 37) figures in several of the early inscriptions of Râjarâja making enquiries about the management of Śaiva temples, asking for their accounts and rectifying abuses. He was probably the son of Madhurântakaṉ Uttama-Chôḷa, the predecessor of Râjarâjadêva. It is not altogether impossible that this Madhurântakaṉ Gaṇḍarâdittaṉâr was the author of the hymn in the *Tiruviśaippâ* under reference.

[4] No. 221 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1894.

It has been already pointed out that Râjarâja's conquests extended over almost the whole of the present Madras Presidency and included also Ceylon, portions of the southern districts of Bombay and the 'twelve thousand old islands' whose identification is not quite certain. His inscriptions, however, are mostly confined to the Śôṛa-maṇḍalam, *i.e.*, the Chôḷa country proper which included the Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts; the Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam or Jayaṅgoṇḍachôḷa-maṇḍalam to which belonged the South Arcot, Chingleput, North Arcot and Chittoor districts; the Pâṇḍi-maṇḍalam (surnamed Râjarâja-maṇḍalam) which included Madura, Ramnad and Tinnevelly districts; Malai-nâḍu[1]; Gaṅgapâḍi, Nuḷambapâḍi, Taḍigaipâḍi, and Kuḍamalai-nâḍu which formed the whole of the present Mysore State, Coorg and a portion of the Anantapur district; and Îra-maṇḍalam (Ceylon) which was otherwise called Mummaḍiśôṛa-maṇḍalam. Consequently the conquests of Râjarâja such as those of Vêṅgai-nâḍu, Raṭṭapâḍi, etc., where his inscriptions are not found, could not have amounted to anything like annexation of those kingdoms into the Chôḷa territory.

The main divisions and sub-divisions given below are taken from the inscriptions of Râjarâja copied so far by the Madras Epigraphist's Office.[2] It may be noted that while the sub-divisions are generally named after the chief village, the main divisions receive their names from the titles of the king. It appears also that the territorial limits of the divisions could not have changed with the change of rulers but often fresh names were conferred on them. Of the villages in each sub-division entered below, those enclosed in brackets are the modern names and those printed in italics are taken from the inscriptions of Râjarâja other than those of Tanjore.

A.—ŚÔṚA-MAṆḌALAM.

I.—Arumoṛidêva-vaḷanâḍu (Teṉ Kaḍuvây)[3]—

(1) Aḷa-nâḍu:—Kîṛaiyil *alias* Paramêśvaramaṅgalam, Porundambondai and Śembiyaṉmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(2) Ârvala-kûṟṟam:—Ârvalam (Alivalam), Mâliṉûr, Tiruttengûr (Tiruttangúr) and Vaḍaviṟaiyâṉpaḷḷam.

(3) Iḍaiyaḷa-nâḍu:—Ariñjigai-chaturvêdimaṅgalam and Kundavai-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(4) Iṅgaṉâḍu:—Ârappâṛ (Árppár), Kañjâranagar (Kanjánagaram), Kîrandêvaṉkuḍi (Kírankudi), Kîṛvaḍugakkuḍi (Vadugakkudi), Kurukkai (Korukkai), Pâlûr *or* Pâlaiyûr (Pálaiyúr), Râjakêsarinallûr, Taṉṉîrkkuṉṟam *alias* Râjarâjanallûr (Tannirkunnam), Uchchipâḍi, Vimalachittamaṅgalam and *Paṉṟûr*.

(5) Maṅgala-nâḍu:—Maṅgalam (Mangal).

---

[1] That Râjarâja conquered the combined armies of the Pâṇḍyas and Chêras in Malai-nâḍu is clear from his inscriptions. But strangely enough no inscriptions of his appear to exist in the Chêra country, *i.e.*, the present Malabar and Travancore. The only place mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions as belonging to Malai-nâḍu is noted in the list.

[2] Chôḷa inscriptions subsequent to the time of Râjarâja supply the names of many more divisions and sub-divisions. These will be published in a later volume of Chôḷa inscriptions.

[3] Kaḍuvây is perhaps identical with the river Kaduveiyâru in the Negapatam taluka. The villages mentioned under this head are found in the Negapatam, Nannilam, Tirutturaipundi, Mayavaram and Mannargudi taluks.

(6) Nenmali (Nemmêli)-nâḍu :—Ârârrûr, Kunriyûr (Kunniyúr), Neḍumaṇal *alias* Madanamañjari-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Tiruvarámésvaram), Palliyil, Śurâṇkuḍi, Kôṭṭûr (Kóttúr) and *Paruttikkuḍi* (Parittikudi).

(7) Puliyûr-nâḍu :—Muruganallûr and *Tirukkârâyil* (Thirukkáravásal).

(8) Puraṅgarambai-nâḍu :—Arumoridêva-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Arimulidévan *or* Arumolitévan), Kaḷappâr (Kalappar), Keruvattûr, Kôri, Kôyilâr-Pudukkuḍi *alias* Kôdaṇḍa-râma-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Pallavanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Sembiamahádévi), Paṇaiyûr (Panaiyúr), Perumbalamarudûr, Śembiyanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Śiṅgaḷântaka-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Singalándi), Vaṅganagar (Vanganagar) [1], Vaṉkorraṅ-guḍi Pâśippuram and *Tirukkaḷar* (Tirukkalar).

(9) Takkaḷûr-nâḍu :—Kodimaṅgalam [2] and Vêṇelviḍugu-Pallavapuram [3].

(10) *Valivala-kûrram* :—*Kîraṅguḍi.*

(11) Vaṇḍârai-Vêḷûr-kûrram :—Koṇṇûr, Kûṛûr and Kurumba . . . ., Dânatoṅag chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

II. [4] Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇi-vaḷanâḍu (Vaḍa-Kaḍuvây or Vaḍa-nâḍu):—

(1) Aḷa-nâḍu :—Pâppârkuḍi (Pappakudi), Peruṅgaḍambûr (Perunkadambanúr) and Porundambondai.

(2) Iṅgaṇâḍu :—Iṅgaṇ (Enkan).

(3) Marugal-nâḍu :—Marugal (Tirumarugal), Pûdaṉûr (Pudanur), Tañjâvûr (Tanjore) and Vaippûr (Vaippúr).

(4) Muraiyûr-nâḍu :—Kundavai-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(5) Paṇaiyûr-nâḍu :—Pugalôgamâṇikka-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(6) Paṭṭina-kûrram [5] :—Kaḷḷûr (Kallúr) *alias* Śaṉṉamaṅgalam [1], Koṭṭârakkuḍi (Kottá-rakudi), Tirukkaṇṇaṅguḍi [6] (Thirukkannankudi), *Âṉaimaṅgalam* (Anaimangalam), *Kôvûr* (Kókúr), *Śivaḷaiykkuḍi*, *Muñjikuḍi* (Munjikudi), *Pirambil* (Pirambil), *Mûṅgirkuḍi* (Mungil-kudi), *Nallûrchchêri*, *Kaḍambaṉûr* (Agarakkadambanúr), *Nâraṇamaṅgalam* (Náranaman-galam), *Vêḷaṅguḍi* (Velangudi), *Narimaṉram* (Narimanam), *Śâttamaṅgalam* (Sathamangalam), *Uttûr* (Uttur), *Naṉṉimaṅgalam* (Nannimangalam), *Peruvanûr*, *Âlaṅguḍi* (Álangudi), *Turaiyûr* (Turaiyur), *Śêndamaṅgalam* (Sendamangalam), *Śiruchchêndamaṅgalam*, *Kurrâlam* (Kuttálam), *Tiruvâvûr*, *Uvarkkuḍi* (Ovarkudi), *Kaḍambaivâḍagai*, *Pâlaṅkorraṅguḍi* (Kottangudi) and *Veṇkiḍaṅgil* (Kidangil).

(7) Śêrrûr-kûrram :—Kuḍavâyil (Kudavásal), Nâlûr (Nalur), Śêrrûr (Settúr) and Marudattûr.

(8) Têvûr-nâḍu :—Âlattûr (Álattúr).

(9) Tirunaraiyûr-nâḍu :—Śrîtuṅgamaṅgalam [1] *alias* Abhimâṇabhûshaṇa-chaturvêdi-maṅgalam, Arakkaṇkuḍi (Arukakudi), Karkuḍi [1] (Karkudi), Kûrûr, *Mâdânamaṅgalam* alias *Pâradâyakuḍi*, *Paraiyâru* (Palaiyar), Piḍâraśêri, Tirunaraiyûr [1] (Tirunaraiyúr) and Vaṇḍârañjêri (Vanduvánjéri).

(10) Tiruvârûr-kûrram (on the north bank of the Kâvêrî) :—Âḍiyappimaṅgalam or *Aḍiyappi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* (Adiyakkamangalam), Kîrkkuḍi and *Vêlaṅguḍi.*

---

[1] This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

[2] Tirumîṉkunram and Paruttiyûr were perhaps near this village.

[3] This was close to the Pâṇḍavây river.

[4] The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakónam, Negapatam, Nannilam and Máyavaram taluks.

[5] In the large Leyden plates this name is spelt Paṭṭanakkûrram.

[6] Kôchcheṅgaṉ built a Vishṇu temple here.

(11) Vêḷâ-nâḍu :—Maṉarkâlappaḷḷi (Manakkal), Peṇpaḷḷi[1], Perumbôṟ, Râjamalla-chaturvêdimaṅgalam and *Tirunallûr* (Tirunallúr).

III. [2]Kêraḷântaka-*or* Tenkarai Kêraḷântaka-vaḷanâḍu.

(1) Śûralûr-kûṟṟam :—Śôṟa-Uttama-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(2) Taṭṭaigaḷa-nâḍu :—Kaṟṟaḷi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam and *Dêvaṉappaḷḷi* (Somur).

(3) Uṟaiyûr-kûṟṟam :—Ariñjigai-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Karuppûr (Karuppúr), Râjâśraya-chaturvêdimaṅgalam *or* Nandipanmamaṅgalam (Uyyakkondan-Tirumalai)[3], Vayalûr (Vayalúr), Râjarâja-chaturvêdimaṅgalam[4], *Tirupparâyltuṟai* (Tiruppalâtturai), *Vijayâṅkura-chaturvêdimaṅgalam*, *Îśâṉamaṅgalam* (Tiruchchendurai), *Allûr* (Allúr) and *Śiṟṟambal* or *Tiruchchirâppaḷi* (Trichinopoly).

IV. [5]Râjêndrasiṁha-vaḷanâḍu *or* Vaḍagarai Râjêndrasiṁha-vaḷanâḍu:—Parântaka-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Puliyûr (Piliyúr), Śrî-Vîranârâyaṇa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam *or* Vîranârâyaṇa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(1) Adigaimaṅgai-nâḍu :—Perundôṭṭam.

(2) Aṇḍâṭṭu-kûṟṟam:—Kavaiyattalai *alias* Paṇḍitaśôṟa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Śattimaṅgalam, Toṟûr and *Tiruppurambiyam* (Tiruppirambiyam).

(3) Iṉṉambar (Innambúr)-nâḍu :—Âdaṉûr (Âdanúr), Aśugûr (Asúr), Êr *alias* Mummaḍiśôṟamaṅgalam (Eragaram), Koṭṭaiyúr (Kottaiyûr), Paṟaiya-Vâṇavaṉmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Śrî-Parântaka-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Karuppûr (Karuppúr) and Maruttuvakkuḍi (Maruttuvakkudi).

(4) Iruṅgôḷappâḍi :—Vaḷavaṉmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(*a*) *Paruvû[r]-kûṟṟam* :—*Neṟkuppai* (Neikkuppai).

(5) *Kâr-nâḍu* :—*Dvêdaikômapuram* part of *Śrî-Vîranârâyaṇa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam*.

(6) Koṇḍa-nâḍu :—Pañchavaṉmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(7) Kuṟukkai-nâḍu :—Kaḍalaṅguḍi (Kadalangudi)[6], Kâṭṭiyâr-brahmadêyam, Kâvirimaṅgalam, Kuṟukkai (Korokkai) and Varagûr.

(8) Maṇṇi-nâḍu :—Êmanallûr *alias* Trailôkyamahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Iḍaiyarnallûr (Edaiyarnallúr), Iḍavai, Nâṭṭârmaṅgalam (Nattaramangalam), Paṇaṇḍâḍi, Vêmbaṟṟûr *alias* Avaninârâyaṇa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam[7] (Véppattúr), *Tirukkuḍittiṭṭai* (Tirukkalittattai) and *Tiruviśalûr* (Tiruvisalúr).

(9) Miṟai-kûṟṟam *or* Miṟai-nâḍu :—Kâmaravalli or Kâmaravalli-chaturvêdimaṅgalam[8] (Kámarasavalli), Pârthivaśêkhara-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Irâmaṉûr, Kaḷḷûr (Kallur), Tirupparaṇam (Tiruppayanam) and Tiruttêvaṉkuḍi.

(10) Miṟalai-nâḍu (also called Vaḍagarai Miṟalai-nâḍu) :—Śêynallûr and *Ilachchikuḍi* alias *Virarpura*.

(11) Nallâṟṟûr-nâḍu :—Kaḍavâymaṅgalam and Mahêndrakôṭṭûr.

---

[1] This village adjoined Maṉarkâlappaḷḷi.

[2] The villages in this division are found in the Kulittalai and Trichinopoly taluks.

[3] No. 455 of 1908 mentions this village in Pâṇḍyakulâśani-vaḷanâḍu. Perhaps Teṉkarai Kêraḷântaka-vaḷanâḍu was contiguous with or part of Pâṇḍyakulâśani-vaḷanâḍu.

[4] Peruṅguḍi was a hamlet of this village.

[5] The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakonam, Mannargudi, Mayavaram, Nannilam, Shiyali, Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Udaiyarpalaiyam taluks.

[6] This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

[7] In the last years of Râjarâja I it was called Śôramârttâṇḍa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

[8] Koṭṭaiyûr was a hamlet of this village.

(12) Nâṅgûr-nâḍu :—Kuṉṟam, Marudûr (Marudúr) and Nâṅgûr (Nángúr).

(13) Neluvûr-nâḍu :—Kumarâditya-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(14) Piḍavûr-nâḍu :—Nayadîramaṅgalam and *Piḍavûr* (Tiruppattúr).

(15) Poygai-nâḍu :—Gaṇḍarâditya-chaturvêdimaṅgalam [1] (Kandirádittam), Perumbuliyûr (Perumpuliyúr), *Tiruvaiyâṟu* (Tiruvaiyaru)[2] and *Tirumaṟapâḍi* (Tirumalavádi).

(16) Tirukkaṟumala-nâḍu :—Têṉûr (Tenur), Tirukkaṟumalam (Shiyáli) and Udayâditya-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(17) Tiruvâli-nâḍu :—Kuṟuvâṇiyakkuḍi [3] *alias* Parakêsaripuram, Mallikuḍi, Tiruvâli (Tiruváli) and Tiruttêvaṉkuḍi.

(18) Tiruvindaḷûr-nâḍu :—Kañjâranagar (Kanjanagaram), Mârapiḍugudêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam and Tirunaṉṟiyûr.

(19) Uttuṅgatuṅga-vaḷanâḍu *or* Vaḍagarai-Kuṉṟa-kûṟṟam :—Paṟuvûr (Paluvúr), Iraikkuḍi (Erakudi) and *Śiṟupaṟuvûr* (Kilappaluvur).

(20) Veṇṇaiyûr-nâḍu :—Mâdulavêḷûr, Pâppârkuḍi (Páppákkudi), Peruṅgaṉbûr, Śôdiyakkuḍi (Sódiyakkudi) and Veḷḷûr (Vélúr).

(21) Vêśâlippâḍi :—Jayaṅkoṇḍa-Śôṟa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(22) Viḷattûr (Velattúr)-nâḍu :—Kâṭṭûr (Káttúr).

V. [4] Râjâśraya-vaḷanâḍu (Maṟa-nâḍu) :—Śaṅgatti-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(1) Kaḷâra-kûṟṟam :—Iṟaiyâṉśêri, Mândôṭṭam[5] and Parâkramaśôṟa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(2) Mîmalai :—Kshatriyasiṁha-chaturvêdimaṅgalam and Mahêndramaṅgalam (Mahendramangalam).

(3) Pâchchiṟ-kûṟṟam :—Kârimaṅgalam

(*a*) Mî-Palâṟu :—Âṉpaṉûr [6].

(*b*) Kîṟ-Palâṟu :—Îṅgaiyûr (Ingúr), Perumarudûr (Perumarudúr) and Tuṟaiyûr (Turaiyúr) ; Paṇamaṅgalavaṉakarai-paṟṟu :—Paṇamaṅgalam (Panamangalam) and Śâttaṉpâḍi (Sattanpadi).

(4) Śemburai-kaṇḍam :—Śiṟu-Śemburai (Sembarai).

(5) Vaḍavaṟi-nâḍu :—Tiruveḷḷarai (Tiruvallarai).

(6) Veṇkôṉkuḍi-kaṇḍam :—Veṇkôṉkuḍi [7] (Vengangudi) and Mâgâṇikuḍi.

VI. [8] Nittavinôda-vaḷanâḍu :—Râjakêsari-chaturvêdimaṅgalam [9].

(1) Âvûr-kûṟṟam :—Âmuttiravalli *or* *Amitravalli-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* (Amuttiraveli), Irumbudal *alias* Manukulachûḷâmaṇi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Irumbutelai), Kûṉargaḷ-Muṉṉiyûr, Viḷattûr [10], Naraśiṅga-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Narasingampet), Paṭṭam (Pattam) and Śembaṅguḍi (Sembangudi).

---

[1] Kulamâṇikkam and Nakkapirâṉkuṟichchi were hamlets of this village.

[2] This place is identical with Tiruvâḍi near which is situated Tillasthânam of Vaḍagarai Râjarâja-vaḷanâḍu. Evidently the place was on the border-land between the two districts.

[3] This was a *dêvadâna* of the Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tañjâvûr.

[4] The villages in this division are found in the Musiri and Trichinopoly taluks.

[5] The river Agaiyâṟu passed through this village.

[6] Śeṭṭimaṅgalam and Tiruppaiññîli were perhaps near this village.

[7] Vaḍagarai Veṇkôṉkuḍi is mentioned in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 73.

[8] The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakonam, Mannargudi and Tanjore taluks.

[9] Mâṅguḍi was a hamlet of this village.

[10] This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

(2) Kândâra-nâḍu :—Viśaiyâlaya- *or* Vijayâlaya-chaturvêdimaṅgalam and Ravikulamâṉikkanallûr.

(3) Karambai-nâḍu :—Kundavainallûr.

(4) Kiṟâr-kûṟṟam :—Perumâkkaḷûr, Perumilaṭṭûr (Melattur), Śûlamaṅgalam (Sulamangalam), Kiḷimaṅgalam (Kilimangalam) and *Tiruchchatturai*.

(5) Muḍichchô-ṉâḍu *or* Muḍichchôṟa-nâḍu :—Jananâtha-chaturvêdimaṅgalam [1], Śiṟṟiṉavâṟ *alias* Paramêśvara-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.

(6) Nallûr-nâḍu :—Mâṅguḍi (Mángudi), Nallûr *alias* Pañchavaṉmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Nallúr), Râjakêsari-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Peruṅgarai (Perungarai) and Râjarâjapuram.

(7) Pâmbuṉi-kûṟṟam :—Śiṟṟambar (Sittambar), Araiśûr [2] (Arasúr) and Pâmbuṉi (Pámani).

(8) Poyiṟ-kûṟṟam :—Karachchêri.

(9) Veṉṉi-kûṟṟam :—Kîṟppûṇḍi *alias* Olôkamahâdêvi (*i.e.*, Lôkamahâdêvi)-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Pundi), Mîduvêli, part of Pûdamaṅgalam (Pudamangalam), Nagarakkârikuṟichchi [3], Perunaṅgaimaṅgalam (Perumangalam), Pûvaṉûr *alias* Avaṉikêsari-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Púvanúr), Vaḍatâmarai [4], Veṉṉi [5] (Kóyilvenni), Veṉṉi-Tirappâṉpaḷḷi [6], Koṭṭaiyûr (Kottayúr) and Śrî-Pûdi.

(10) Vîraśôṟa-vaḷanâḍu :—Kamugañjêndaṅguḍi (Séndangudi), Kuḷappâḍi, Peṇḍaḍugalam and Śiṟuveṉṉi.

VII. [7] Uyyakkoṇḍâṉ-vaḷanâḍu (between the rivers Araśil and Kâvêrî).

(1) Âkkûr-nâḍu :—Râjêndrasiṁha-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Talaichcheṅgâḍu and Tirukkaḍavûr (Tirukkadaiyúr).

(2) Ambar (Ambal)-nâḍu :—Adiyaraiyakuṟumbal, Ambapuṟattûr, Avvainallûr (Aivanallúr), Nallaṟundûr, Pireṭṭaikuḍi, *Kuṟumbil* (Kurumbur) and *Tirukkaḍavûr* (Tirucadayúr).

(3) Kuṟumbûr (Kurumbúr)-nâḍu :—Iṟaiyâṉśêri, Kâyâkkuḍi, Kurumbapurattûr, Neḍuṅgâḍu, Taḷichchêri (Talichcheri) *alias* Parâkramaśôṟa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam and Tiruviḍaikkaṟi (Tiruvidakkaḷi).

(4) Marugal-nâḍu :—Marudavûr.

(5) Pâmbura- *or* Pâmbûr-nâḍu :—Kaḍaikkuḍi (Kadakkudi), Nallâvûr (Nallávúr), Pâmburam (Tiruppámpuram) and Tirukkuḍamûkkil [8] (Kumbakonam).

(6) (Teṉkarai)-Tiraimûr-nâḍu :—Neṟkuppai, Śâttaṉûr (Sáttanúr), *Naḍâr* (Nadar), *Nallûrchchêri*, *Tirukkuṟaṅgâḍuturai* (Aduturai) and Mahêndramaṅgalam (Mahéndrappalli).

(7) Tirunaṟaiyûr-nâḍu :—Taṇḍattôṭṭam *alias* Mummaḍiśôṟa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam (Tandantóttam).

(8) Tiruvaṟundûr (Tiruviḷandúr)-nâḍu :—Akkaḷûr (Akkalur), Ayirkâḍu, Nallûr (Nálúr), Pudukkuḍi (Pudukkudi), Vaṟagûr (Vaḷuvúr) and *Nallûr*.

---

[1] Kuṭṭimaṅgalam was a hamlet of this village.

[2] This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

[3] Adjoined Mîduvêli.

[4] This place adjoined Nagarakârikuṟichchi.

[5] Śiṟu-Muṉṉiyûr was a village near this.

[6] This place adjoined Vaḍatâmarai.

[7] The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakonam, Mayavaram and Nannilam taluks.

[8] Tiruvalañjuṟi was a suburb of this village.

(9) Vennâḍu :—Amankuḍi *alias* Kêralântaka-chaturvêdimangalam (Ammangudi), Karuvili (Karuveli), Maṟalai or Tirumaṟalai (Tiruvilimalalai), Tirunâllam (Kónérirâjapuram), Vaigal (Vaiyal) *alias* Vânavanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam, Vayalûr (Vayalúr) and Vaḍagarai-mangalam.

(10) Viḷai-nâḍu :—Paṟiyalûr, Perumuḷai, Tiraimûr and Viḷainagar *alias* Nittavinôda-chaturvêdimangalam.

VIII. [1] Pâṇḍya (Pâṇḍi) kulâśani-vaḷanâḍu (the later Pâṇḍikulapati-vaḷanâḍu, also called Teṉkarai-nâḍu) :—Parântaka-chaturvêdimangalam.

(1) Ârkkâṭṭu-kûṟṟam :—Âyirattaḷi, Ôdavêli (Ombattuveli), Perumangalam (Perumangalam), Pirambil, Pûdikuḍi, Śandiralêgai [2] (Sendalai near Tirukkáttuppalli), *Pêṟâṟk-kâḍu* (Arkadu), *Pêṟaṟaiśûr* and *Tirukkaṇḍiyûr* [3].

(2) Eyi-nâḍu :—Tiruppêr (Tiruppayar) and Aṭṭuppaḷḷi-Niyamam.

(3) Eriy- *or* Eriyûr-nâḍu :—Karuvugal-Vallam and Viṇṇaṉêri *alias* Mummaḍiśôḻanallûr (Mummudisolamangalam).

(4) Iḍaiyâṟṟu (Edaiyár)-nâḍu :—Iḍaiyâṟṟumangalam (Edayáttimangalam), Toṇḍavai-chaturvêdimangalam, *Nittavinîtamangalam* and *Tiruttavatturai* (Tiruttavatturaikattalai) [4].

(5) Kiḻiyûr-nâḍu :—Mâṟaṉêri (Márnéri) and Andavanallûr (Andanallúr).

(6) Kîḻ-Śengiḷi-nâḍu :—Mangalanallûr.

(7) Kîḻ-Śûdi-nâḍu :—Arumaḍal (Arumadal), Kuṟukkai, Nâvalûr (Návalúr) and Vaḍavâyiḍam.

(8) Mîy-, Mêl- *or* Mî-Śengiḷi-nâḍu :—Kaḍaikkuḍi (Kadayakkudi), Vangâram *alias* Tirunârâyaṇa-chaturvêdimangalam, Kaḷattûr (Kalattúr), Kâvaṉûr (Kávanúr), Kiḷḷikuḍi, Kôyilnallûr, Mangalam (Mangalam), Virâṟkuḍi and Viśalûr.

(9) Mîyvaṟi-nâḍu *or* Mîypoṟi-nâḍu :—Kâṭṭiñâṟal, Kôyilnallûr and Mêṟkuḍi

(10) Paṉangâḍu-nâḍu :—Paṉangulam, Perumbuliyûr, Perungôḷûr and Peruñjôlai.

(11) Tañjâvûr-kûṟṟam :—Tañjâvûr (Tanjore); Tañjâvûr-paṟṟu :—Karundiṭṭaiguḍi (on the north bank of Vaḍavâṟu and outside Tañjâvûr [5]).

(12) Puṉṟiṟ-kûṟṟam :—Maṟaiyûr, Paṟaiyûr, Śâttamangalam (Sáttamangalam) and Viraikkuḍi.

(13) Puṟakkiḷiyûr-nâḍu :—Kâmadamangalam and Kiḷḷikuḍi.

(14) Śuṇḍaimûlai-nâḍu :—Koṟṟamangalam (Kottamangalam).

(15) Vaḍa-Kavira-nâḍu :—Tiruneḍungalam (Tirunedungalam).

(16) Vaḍaśiṟuvây- *or* *Vaḍaśiṟuvâyil*-nâḍu :—Vâḷuvamangalam and Viraikkuḍi.

(17) Vilâ-nâḍu :—Malari *alias* Śrîkaṇḍa-chaturvêdimangalam, Śôḻamahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam (Sólamádevi) and Uttamaśîli-chaturvêdimangalam (Uttamaséri).

IX. [6] Vaḍagarai Râjarâja-vaḷanâḍu :—Kîḻ-Tengampûṇḍi *alias* Kumâramangalam (Kumaramangalam), Kôdaṇḍapuram, Nâṭṭârnallûr, Perumbulivây (*surrounding*

---

[1] The villages in this division are found in the Perambalur, Trichinopoly, Udaiyarpalaiyam and Tanjore taluks.

[2] Narikkuḍichchêri and Tugavûr were hamlets of this village.

[3] The place was also known as Âyirattaḷi in the time of Râjêndra-Chôḷa I and was included in Kiṟâr-kûṟṟam of Nittavinôda-vaḷanâḍu.

[4] This name is taken from an inscription at Lalgudi which is not far from it.

[5] Sâmantanârâyaṇa-chaturvêdimangalam and Virudarâjabhayankara-chaturvêdimangalam were in the neighbourhood of Tañjâvûr.

[6] The villages in this division are found in the Perambalur, Trichinopoly and Udaiyarpalaiyam taluks.

Iḷambulivây), Teṅgampûṇḍi *alias* Satyâśraykulakâla-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Umaiyûr *alias* Raṭṭakulakâla-chaturvêdimaṅgalam, Uppûr (Uppúr) *alias* Raṭṭakulakâla-chaturvêdimaṅgalam[1] and Veṭṭiyâr Paḍaivîḍu *alias* Jayaṅgoṇḍaśôḷanallûr.

(1) Êmappêr-kûṟṟam :—Kaṉṉikuḍi.

(2) Kîḻ-Vêṅgai-nâḍu :—Jayaṅgoṇḍaśôḷanallûr, Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇipuram, Malaiyâṉpaḍaivîḍu, Nambaṉkârai, Pâṇḍyakulântakanallûr, Râjavidyâdharanallûr, Śundaraśôḷanallûr, and Talaivâymaṅgalam.

(3) Kuṉṟiṟ-kûṟṟam :—Tiruvâvaṇam and Vîraikkuḍi.

(4) Paṉṟiyûr-nâḍu :—Paṉṟiyûr and Perumuḷḷûr.

(5) *Poygai-nâḍu* :—*Tirunettâṉam* (Tillasthanam).

(6) Poyiṟ-kûṟṟam :—Aṛagiyaśôḷapuram, Koṟṟamaṅgalam (Kottamangalam), Maṅgalavâyil, Pâchchil (Tiruvási), Śiṟukuḷattúr (Sirukalattúr) and Teṉkuḍi.

(7) Pulivala-kûṟṟam :—Kalaiyaṉpâḍi and Tirubhuvanam (Tiruppuvanam).

(8) Puṉṟil - *or* Puṉṟiṟ-kûṟṟam :—Kaḷamalai (Kalamalai).

(9) Śeṉṉimaṅgala-kûṟṟam :—Kaṉṉikuḍi and Ôlamaṅgalam (Ólappádi).

(10) Varagûr (Varagúr)-nâḍu :—Pûvâṟ (Púválúr).

B.—TOṆḌAI-NÂḌU *alias* JAYAṄGOṆḌAŚÔḶA-MAṆḌALAM.

I. *Malâḍu* alias *Jananâtha-vaḷanâḍu* :

(1) *Kurukkai-kûṟṟam* :—*Tirukkôvalûr* (Tirukkoilur), *Śiṟṟiṅgûr* (Siddhalingamadam).

(2) *Pânûr-kûṟṟam* :—*Iṟaiyâṉaṟaiyûr* (Elvanasur).

II. *Tirumuṉaippâḍi* or *Muṉaippâḍi* on the north bank of *Peṇṇai*—*Pêṟiṅgûr* (Pérangiyúr).

(1) *Mêlûr-nâḍu* :—*Tirunâvalûr* (Tirunamanallur).

III. Ôymâ-nâḍu.

(1) *Âṇmûr-nâḍu* :—*Maṇali* (Manalpadi).

(2) *Kîḻkai-nâḍu* :—*Giḍaṅgil* (Gidangil).

(3) Pêrâyûr-nâḍu :—Pêrâyûr (Perávúr).

IV. *Aruvâ-nâḍu* :—

(1) *Vâgûr-nâḍu* or *Kîḻvaḷi-Vâgûr-nâḍu* :—*Vâgûr* alias *Aṛagiyaśôḷa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* (Báhúr).

(2) *Vâvalûr-nâḍu* :—*Tiuvâmâttûr* (Tiruvamattur).

V. *Vâṇagôppâḍi* :—*Maṟuvûr* (*on the south bank of the Peṇṇai*) alias *Vayirамêga-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.*

VI. *Vâḷaiyûr* (*on the north bank of the Peṇṇai*) alias *Nittavinôdapuram* (Jambai).

VII. *Vaḍagarai-Vêśâlippâḍi* :—

(1) *Vâgûr-nâḍu* :—*Tâmanallûr.*

C.—TOṆḌAI-NÂḌU, TOṆḌAI-MAṆḌALAM or JAYAṄGOṆḌACHÔḶA-MAṆḌALAM :—Tribhuvanamahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam [*alias*] Tiruvakkarai.

I. *Veṉkuṉṟa-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Perumaṇḍai-nâḍu* :—*Perumaṇḍai.*

---

[1] Paraṅguḷam was a hamlet of this village.

II. Tâmar-kôṭṭam.

(1) Tâmar-nâḍu :—Tâmar *alias* Nittavinôdanallûr.

(2) *Valla-nâḍu* :—*Gôvindapâḍi* (Tirumalpur).

III. *Kuṉṟavattana-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Mênmalai-Taṉiyal-nâḍu* :—*Jananâtha-chaturvêdimaṅgalam.*

IV. *Âmûr-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Âmûr-nâḍu* :—*Mâmallapuram* (Mahábalipuram).

(2) *Kumiṟi-nâḍu* :—*Talaiśayaṉapuram* alias *Taiyûr* alias *Râjakêsarinallûr* (Taiyúr).

(3) *Paḍuvûr-nâḍu* :—Paḍuvûr (Padúr), *Tiruviḍavandai* (Tiruvadandai).

V. *Puliyûr-kôṭṭam* :—*Mayilârppil* (Mylapore).

(1) *Kôṭṭûr-nâḍu* :—*Veḷichchêri* (Velachcheri).

(2) *Śurattûṟ-nâḍu* :—*Taṉṉiyâlattûr.*

(3) *Tuḍamuṉi-nâḍu* :—*Tiruvalidâyam* (Pádi).

VI. *Ûṟṟukkâṭṭu-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Ûṟṟukkâṭṭu-kûṟṟam* :—*Uttama-Śôḻa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* (Tenneri).

(2) *Nîrvêḷûṟ-nâḍu* :—*Kûram* alias *Vidyâvinîta-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* (Kúram).

VII. *Śeṅgâṭṭu-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Mâgaṉûṟ-nâḍu* :—*Maṇimaṅgalam* alias *Lôkamahâdêvi-chaturuvêdimaṅgalam* (Manimangalam).

VIII. *Kâliyûr-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Kâliyûr-kûṟṟam* :—*Uttaramêru-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* (Uttaramallur), *Śivachûḷâmaṇimaṅgalam* (Ukkal) and *Tiruvottûr* (Tiruvottúr).

IX. *Puraṟ-kôṭṭam* :—*Ninranûr*

(1) *Puṟal-nâḍu* :—Tiruvoṟṟiyûr (Tiruvottiyúr).

X. *Paḍuvûr-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Paṅgaḷa-nâḍu* :—*Mugai-nâḍu* :—*Uyyakkoṇḍâṉ* - *Śôḻapuram* (Solapuram near Vellore).

(2) *Peruntimiri-nâḍu* :—Tiruppâṉmalai (Panchapandavamalai).

(3) *Mîyâṟu-nâḍu* :—Tiruvallam (Tiruvallam).

XI. *Maṇayiṟ-kôṭṭam.*

(1) *Paṉmâ-nâḍu* ;—*Tiruvûral* (Takkolam)[1], *Kayattâr* (*part of Tiṟuvûralpuram*).

XII. *Perumbâṇappâḍi.*

(1) *Tiruvêṅgaḍa-kôṭṭam* :—

(*a*) *Âṟṟûr-nâḍu* :—*Tirukkâḷatti* (Kalahasti).

(*b*) *Kuḍavûr-nâḍu* :—*Tiruchchôgaṉûr* (Tiruchchanur).

(*c*) Tûñâḍu ;—Mêṟpâḍi *alias* Râjâśrayapuram (Melpadi).

D.—PÂṆḌI-NÂḌU *alias* RÂJARÂJA-MAṆḌALAM or RÂJARÂJA-VAḶANÂḌU.

I. Perumbûr-nâḍu :—Aṇḍakkuḍi (Andakkudi).

II. Tirukkâṉappêr-kûṟṟam :—Pâḷûr.

III. *Muḷḷi-nâḍu* :—*Iyalâṭṭimaṅgalam*, *Râjarâja-chaturvêdimaṅgalam*, *Śêramâṉmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* or *Nigariliśôḻa-chaturvêdimaṅgalam* (Sérmádévi).

IV. *Nâñji-nâḍu* :—*Tiruchchivîndiram* (Suchíndram).

---

[1] Śiṟûr formed a portion of Tiruvûralpuram.

V. *Kirkaḷa-kûṟṟam*:—*Tirumukkûḍal* (or) *Teṉ-Tirumâliruñjôlai* (Sevilipéri), *Śrî-Vallabhamaṅgalam* (Gangaikondán).

VI. *Kêraḷaśiṅga-vaḷanâḍu* :—*Tirupputtûr* (Tirupputtur).

VII. *Śûraṅguḍi-nâḍu*:—*Âdaṉûr* (Ádanúr).

E.—MALAI-NÂḌU.

I. Veḷḷappa-nâḍu:—Pudukkôḍu.

F.—GAṄGAPÂḌI.

I. Padi-nâḍu :—Âlûr (Alur).

G.—NUḶAMBAPÂḌI *alias* NIGARILIŚÔṚAPÂḌI.

I. Paṟivai-nâḍu:—Kûḍalûr and Kuśavûr.

H.—ÎḺAM *alias* MUMMAḌIŚÔṚA-VAḶANÂḌU *or*-MAṆḌALAM [1] (CEYLON).

I. Kaṇakkaṉ-Kôṭṭiyâram *alias* Vikramaśôṛa-vaḷanâḍu :—Mâśâr.

II. Mâppiśumbu-Kôṭṭiyâram *alias* Râjarâja-vaḷanâḍu.

I.—MISCELLANEOUS DIVISIONS NOT DEFINED [2].

I. Vaḍa-Kônâḍu:—Turaikkuḍi (Turaikkudi).

II. Śuttamalli-vaḷanâḍu.

III. Veṇṇi-kûṟṟam:—Śiṟumaṅgalam (Sirumangalam).

IV. *Vaḍagarai Râjâśraya-vaḷanâḍu.*

V. *Kirâṟ-kûṟṟam*:—*Niyamam* (Nemam).

As regards religion and mythology, the Tanjore inscriptions throw considerable light. That king Râjarâjadêva was a staunch Śaiva and that his whole court followed him is amply borne out. The temple at Tanjore which was built by the king was called Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara; the chief image of the central shrine was called Dakshiṇamêru-Viḍaṅgaṉ or Âḍavallâṉ; and the images which were set up by the king, his elder sister, his queens and his officers were mostly Śaiva. It has been pointed out that the names Dakshiṇamêru-Viḍaṅgaṉ and Âḍavallâṉ given to the chief image in the temple indicate clearly that the Śaiva creed derived its support at the time mainly from Chidambaram in the South Arcot district.

An image of Kirâtârjuna was set up in the Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara temple by the magistrate (*adhikâri*) Udayadivâkaraṉ Tillaiyâḷi. The detailed description of the image is not furnished. But it evidently represented the scene of fight between Arjuna and the god guised as a *kirâta* or hunter. The fight ended in the former obtaining the blessings of the latter together with the weapon known as *pâśupatâstra.*[3]

---

[1] *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, p. 96.

[2] The divisions mentioned under this head would have probably belonged to Sôṛa-maṇḍalam. Veṇṇi-kûṟṟam and Kiṟâr-kûṟṟam are mentioned as sub-divisions of Nittavinôda-vaḷanâḍu. The village Turaikkudi is in the Trichinopoly taluk while Sirumangalam and Nemam are in Tanjore. Consequently it looks as if the divisional names Vaḍa-Kônâḍu, Śuttamalli-vaḷanâḍu and Vaḍagarai Râjâśraya-vaḷanâḍu are only alternative names of some of the divisions mentioned already under Śôṛa-maṇḍalam, if not new ones.

[3] Kirâtârjuna-mûrti is one of the 25 sportive incarnations (*lîlâ-mûrtis*) of Śiva mentioned in the *Kâraṇâgama.* It describes him as follows :—

चतुर्भुजं त्रिणेत्रं च जटामकुटसंयुतम् ।
सर्वाभरणसंयुक्तं दिव्यांबरसमावृतम् ॥
धनर्बाणयुतं रक्तं कृष्णापरशुसंयुतम् ।
उपवीतसमायुक्तं समभंगतनुं कुरु ॥

वामे गौरीसमायुक्तं दक्षिणेत्वर्जुनं स्थितम् ।
अर्जुनस्वरूपम्—
एकवक्त्रं द्विनयनं जटामकुटसयुतम् ।
सर्वाभरणसंयुक्तं कृतांजलिपुटं स्थितम् ॥

Inscriptions on the pillars and niches of the enclosing verandah generally describe groups of copper images set up in the temple and the gifts made to them. The former comprise gods and canonized Śaiva saints. Among the gods the groups representing Pichchadêvar and Kalyâṇasundarar are interesting from the view point of Hindu iconography. The first was set up by Râjarâja's queen Lôkamahâdêvî (No. 9). The group consisted of the god Śiva with four arms in a standing posture accompanied on one side by a standing goblin (called generally Guṇḍôdara) carrying the begging bowl on his head, and by an antelope on the other. This description agrees in the main with the figure of Bhikshâṭanamûrti which we find in Śiva temples.[1] In a niche on the south wall of the central shrine is a beautiful image of Pichchâṇḍâr but without the goblin and the antelope. It is worthy of note that there is a temple dedicated to Pichchâṇḍâr near Trichinopoly.

The group described in No. 48 was set up by queen Trailôkya-Mahâdêvî. The name Kalyâṇasundara means ' Sundara (preparing himself for the) marriage.' The group consisted of the god Śiva with four arms. Close to him was his consort Umâparamêśvarî. An image of god Vishṇu with four arms was pouring water into the hands of the god Śiva, and Brahmâ was comfortably seated offering an oblation.[2] This is the usual representation of the marriage of the god Sundarêśvara of Madura with the goddess Mînâkshî and I remember seeing a good sculpture of it in the Kambattaḍi-maṇḍapa of the Sundarêśvara temple there which was built in the 16th century A.D. by the Nâyaka king Vîrappa-ofâyaka.

Another group designated Pañchadêhamûrtigal [3] is mentioned in No. 30. It consisted ff one image with ten arms in the centre and four other images on the sides, each of the

---

[1] The same *Kâraṇâgama* describes Bhikshâṭana thus :—

चतुर्भुजं त्रिणेत्रं च नग्नं चैव स्मिताननम् ।
भस्मादिग्धं विद्रुमाभं कट्यां पन्नगसंवृतम् ॥
आवृत्तालंकृत भृंगीपादं पादुकसंयुतम् ।
दाक्षिणं तत्कराग्रं तु हरिणास्यानुगं भवेत् ॥
दाक्षिणेऽपरहस्ते तु डमरुं चैव कारयेत् ।
वामे त्वपरहस्ते तु त्रिशूलं पिंछधारिणम् ॥
कुंचितं दक्षिणं पादं वामपादं तु सुस्थितम् ।
समभंगस्थानकं च गमनोन्मुखरूपकम् ॥
कपालोपेतहस्तं च वृषनाभिसमं भवेत् ।
एवं भिक्षाटनं प्रोक्तं गुंडोदरमथो श्रुणु ॥
देवस्य वामपार्श्वे तु गुंडोदरमधः स्थितम् ।
हस्तद्वयसमायुक्तं कपालं शिरसि न्यसेत् ॥
भूताकारसमायुक्तं कुंडले कर्णयोर्न्यसेत् ।
दंष्टाकरालवक्त्रं च पूर्वोक्तं लक्षणान्वितम् ॥

[2] Of Kalyâṇasundara also called Vaivâhikamûrti the following description is given :—

सिंदूराभं त्रिणेत्रं युगभुजसहितं हारकेयूरभूषम्
दिव्यैर्वस्त्रैर्वृतांगं वरकटकलसद्धेमकल्हारभूषम् ।
शंभुं दक्षिणपार्वतीकरतलं सव्येन संगृह्यतम्
टंकं कृष्णमृगं धरं वरकरं चूडेंदुबद्धादरम् ॥
जटामकुटसंयुक्तं चंद्रार्धकृतभूषणम् ।
त्र्यक्षं चतर्भुजं नंस्ये नवयौवनगर्वितम् ॥
समभंगयुतं देवस्थानकं संप्रकीर्तितम् ।
कुंचितं सव्यपादेन स्थितसव्येतरांघ्रिकम् ॥

The figures accompanying Kalyâṇasundara are stated to be (1) Girijâ (*i.e.* Pârvatî) who is of well-formed limbs with two arms and two eyes; (2) Brahmâ of four faces and four hands wearing a sacred thread and scarf, holding in two of his right hands the rosary and the ladle and in the two left, the water-pot and the book, and seated on a lotus flower smiling, in front of a square sacrificial pit with blazing fire in it; (3) Mênakâ attending on Girijâ; (4) Himavat (mountain), holding a golden pot with water by the side of Girijâ and pouring the water through the spout into the hands of Śiva; (5) the sages Sanaka and Sanandana with folded hands on the left side of Śiva; and (6) Vishṇu and other gods who come to attend the marriage. It may be noted that the description given in our inscription differs from the above in stating that Vishṇu with four hands—not Himavat—was pouring water into the hands of the god Śiva.

[3] With Pañchadêhamûrtigal compare Pañchamukha one of the many names of Śiva. The five faces of Śiva are stated to be Sadyôjâta, Vâmadêva, Tatpurusha, Âghôra and Îśâna. The last according to the *Dêvîpurâṇa* is in the middle and higher than the other four. A figure with these five faces is also known as

latter having one face and four arms. The former was 22 *viral* and four *tôrai* in height while the other four were only fourteen *viral* in height [1].

Liṅgapurâṇadêva described in No. 44 is worthy of notice as we very often find a representation of the scene in Śiva temples. The Tanjore temple itself bears a sculpture on the west wall of the central shrine. The group is now known as Liṅgôdbhava.[2] The story is that Brahmâ and Vishṇu once had a dispute about their relative superiority. Both of them appeared before Śiva who had assumed the shape of a huge *liṅga*. Vishṇu had to find out the bottom and Brahmâ the top of this *liṅga*. The former became a boar and went on burrowing into the earth and the latter soared into the air in the shape of a swan to trace the top. Neither of them could achieve his object and accordingly it became evident that Śiva was superior to both of them. In the group set up by queen Abhimânavallî, the gods Brahmâ and Vishṇu figure. The latter is said to have the face of a boar. The swan form of Brahmâ is not mentioned. The group must have closely followed the representation in stone of the same scene on the west wall of the central shrine.

Tradition asserts that the hill at Tiruvaṇṇâmalai in the South Arcot district represents the 'liṅga' of the *Liṅga-purâṇa*. Accordingly pilgrims who visit the temple at Tiruvaṇṇâmalai have to circumambulate the hill itself. It is worthy of note that the *liṅga* at Tiruvaṇṇâmalai is believed to be one of the five *liṅgas* which are supposed to consist of the five elements (*pañchabhûta*). The Êkâmranâtha temple at Conjeeveram has the *prithvî-liṅga* (made of earth) and the Jambukêśvara temple on the island of Śrîraṅgam the *ap-liṅga* (made of water). The *vâyu-liṅga* (made of air) is at Kâḷahasti in the North Arcot district; the *âkâśa-liṅga* (made of space) at Chidambaram and the *tejô-liṅga* (made of light) at Tiruvaṇṇâmalai in the South Arcot district. The ancient names of these five shrines offer

---

Sadâśivamûrti. According to the *Âgamas* it is crystal-white in colour, has matted hair, ten arms, one body and two legs. In the *Śivapurâṇa* the five *mûrtis* of Rudra are thus described:—

एका भगवतो मूर्तिरूर्द्ध्वरोमा भयावहा ।
द्वितीया तस्य वै मूर्तिः सूर्य्यज्योतिःसमप्रभा ॥
तृतीया भगवतो मूर्तिः शशिनः परमात्मनः ।
चतुर्थी भगवतो मूर्तिः कुबेरस्य महातनुः ॥
पञ्चमी भगवतो मूर्तिस्तद्ध्वै ब्रह्म परं पदम् ।
तत्तु पश्यन्ति विद्वांसः सूक्ष्मध्यानविचिन्तकाः ॥

इत्येष भगवान्रुद्रः पञ्चधा परिपठ्यते ।
लोके वेदे च संयुक्ता शैवी चैव पृथक् पृथक् ॥
क्रीडते प्रथमा मूर्तिर्द्वितीया तप्यते तपः ।
तृतीया हरते लोकांश्चतुर्थी सृजते प्रजाः ॥
पञ्चमी ज्ञानसद्भावं सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ।
सर्वेशः सर्वभूतस्थः सर्गप्रलयविक्रमः ॥

The *Dêvîpurâṇa* says:—

शिवस्तत्र स्थितः साक्षात् सर्वपापहरः शुभः ।
स तु पञ्चमुखः ख्यातो लोकसर्वार्थसाधकः ॥
पञ्चब्रह्मात्मको यस्मात्तेन पञ्चमुखः स्मृतः ।
पश्चिमे तु मुख सद्यो वामदेवस्तथोत्तरे ॥
पूर्वे तत्पुरुषं विद्यादघोरं चापि दक्षिणे ।

ईशानः पञ्चमो मध्ये सर्वेषामुपरि स्थितः ॥
एते पञ्चमुखा वत्स पापघ्ना ग्रहनाशनाः ।
सद्योजातो भवेच्छुक्लो वामदेवस्तु पीतकः ॥
रक्तन्त(स्त)त्पुरुषो ज्ञेयोऽघोरः कृष्णः स एव च ।
ईशानः पश्चिमस्तेषां सर्ववर्णसमन्वितः ।

[1] Nos. 274 and 275 of 1911 found on two mutilated pillars of the temple kitchen also describe images, the latter referring to a Pañchadêhamûrti.

[2] The *Kâraṇâgama* states:—

लिंगाकारस्य मध्ये तु चंद्रशेखरवत्स्थितम् ।
नालकाधस्थितं पादं लिंगोद्भवसमन्वितम् ॥
विरिंचिर्हंसरूपेण चोर्ध्वगो वामपार्श्वके ।
दक्ष वराहरूपस्य रूपेणाधोगतो हरिः ॥

वामदक्षिणपार्श्वस्थौ कृतांजलिसमन्वितौ ।
स्वरूपेण द्विपादस्थावजविष्णू विभोः परे ॥

no justification for this supposition. Apparently the idea of tracing them to the five elements is a comparatively recent one.

An image of Ardhanârîśvara was set up by Kṛishṇaṉ Râmaṉ. The image is often met with among the sculptures of Śiva temples in Southern India, and is partly male and partly female. In one of the niches of the north wall of the central shrine of the Tanjore temple there is a figure of Ardhanârîśvara. This differs from the group described in No. 39, there being a bull in the former close to which the figure is standing. A later representation of Ardhanârîśvara in the Madura temple has no bull. In the group set up by Kṛishṇaṉ Râmaṉ and the sculpture on the north wall of the central shrine the Îśvara-half has two arms and the Umâ-half only a single arm. In the Madura sculpture each of them has two arms. Hêmâdri in the *Vratakhaṇḍa* of his *Chaturvargachintâmaṇi* describes the figure of Ardhanârîśvara as having four arms.[1] The group set up by Râjarâja's general was made of copper but the Umâ-half was coated with brass. Closely connected with this group is No. 47 which records the setting up of an image of Bhṛiṅgîśa with three arms and three legs by Kôvaṉ Aṇṇâmalai *alias* Kêraḷântaka-Viṛupparaiyaṉ. It was the exclusive devotion of Bhṛiṅgîśa to the god Śiva that led Pârvatî to seek union with her consort in the form of Ardhanârîśvara.[2] This was perhaps the commencement of the worship of the deity in its feminine aspect.

In the group Umâsahitar described in No. 32, the god and goddess are separate images seated together and accompanied by a standing image of Subrahmaṇya and one of Gaṇapati. The donor was a certain Vêḷâṉ Âdittaṉ *alias* Parântaka-Pallavaraiyaṉ This group is probably the same as that now known under the name Umâ-Mahêśvara, though in the latter Subrahmaṇya and Gaṇapati do not generally figure.[3]

---

[1] अर्द्धं देवस्य नारी तु कर्तव्या शुभलक्षणा ।
अर्द्धं तु पुरुषः कार्यः सर्वलक्षणभूषितः ॥
ईश्वरार्द्धं जटाजूटं कर्त्तव्यं चन्द्रभूषितम् ।
उमार्द्धे तिलकं कार्य्यं सीमन्तमलकं तथा ॥
भस्मोद्धूलितमर्द्धं तु अर्द्धं कुंकुमभूषितम् ।
नागोपवीतिनं चार्द्धमर्द्धं हारविभूषितम् ॥
वामार्द्धे तु स्तनं कुर्य्यात् घनं पीनं सुवर्त्तुलम् ।
उमार्द्धे तु प्रकर्त्तव्यं सुवस्त्रेण च वेष्टितम् ॥
मेखलां दापयेत्तत्र वज्रवैदूर्य्यभूषिताम् ।
ऊर्द्ध्वलिङ्गं महेशार्द्धं सर्पमेखलमण्डितम् ॥
पादञ्च देवदेवस्य समपद्मोपरिस्थितम् ।
सालक्तकं स्मृतं वाममञ्जनेन विभूषितम् ॥
त्रिशूलमक्षसूत्रंच भुजयोः सव्ययोः स्मृतम् ।
दर्पणंचोत्पलं कार्य्यं भुजयोरपसव्ययोः ॥

[2] In his *Bṛihatsaṁhitâ* (chapter xi, verse 43) Varâhamihira describes Śiva as follows :—

शम्भोः शिरसीन्दुकला वृषध्वजोऽक्षि च तृतीयमपि चोर्ध्वम् ।
शूलं धनुः पिनाकं वामार्धे वा गिरिसुतार्धम् ॥

[3] Hêmâdri's description of Umâ-Mahêśvara-mûrti is as follows :—

युग्मं स्त्रीपुरुषं कार्य्यं उमेशौ दिव्यरूपिणौ ।
अष्टवक्त्रं तु देवेशं जटाचन्द्रार्धभूषितम् ॥
द्विपाणिं द्विभुजां देवीं सुमध्यां सुपयोधराम् ।
वामपाणिंतु देवस्य देव्याः स्कन्धे नियोजयेत् ॥
दक्षिणंतु करं शम्भोरुत्पलेन विभूषितम् ।
देव्यास्तु दक्षिणं पाणिं स्कन्धे देवस्य कल्पयेत्
वामपाणौ तथा देव्या दर्पणं दापयेन्दुभम् ॥

In the *Kâraṇâgama*, under *Saparivâr*-Ômâmahêśvara-*dhyâna* occurs the following :—

वामे शैलसुता पुरस्तु वृषभः पश्चात्सुरेंद्रादयो
दैत्यारिश्च विधिश्च पार्श्वदलयोर्वाय्वादिकोणेषु च ।
भृंगीनारदबाणभैरवगजास्यस्कंदवीरेश्वरा
मध्ये शुभ्रसरोजकोमलरुच शंभुं भजे पांडुरम् ॥

Queen Śôṛamahâdêvî set up an image of Ṛishabhavâhanadêva with the goddess Umâparamêśvarî and a bull (No. 46). The god Gaṇapati appears to have been a member of the group though he is not found in the usual representation of Ṛishabhârûḍhamûrti.[1]

The image of Âḍavallâṉ set up by queen Śôṛamahâdêvî (No. 42), is a standing figure of the god with Muyalagaṉ[2] under his feet. The image had four arms, nine braids of hair (*jaṭâ*), the goddess Gaṅgâ-bhaṭṭâraki, on the braided hair and seven flower garlands. The goddess Umâparamêśvarî who formed a part of the group was standing on a separate pedestal. This description corresponds to the representation of one of the many forms of Naṭarâja. Another queen of Râjarâjadêva named Pañchavaṉ-Mahâdêvî set up an image of Śiva in the dancing posture and called it Tañjai-Aṛagar (No. 51). The image was apparently standing with Muśalagaṉ under the foot on which the god stood; the other foot was apparently lifted upwards in dancing though this fact is not specifically stated. An image of Umâparamêśvarî and one of Gaṇapati were included in the group. The image of Patañjali and that of Vyâghrapâda both of which usually accompany the dancing image of Śiva (called Naṭarâja) are not mentioned here. The sages Patañjali and Vyâghrapâda are believed to have been present at the dance of the god Śiva. It is however worthy of note that the same Chôḷa queen set up a separate image of Patañjalidêva (No. 53). It was a solid image and measured "three-quarters and one-eighth (of a *muṛam*) in height from the tail to the hoods (*phaṇa*). It had five hoods, one face in the midst of these hoods, one crown (*makuṭa*), two divine arms, above the navel a human body, and below the navel three coils".

No 50, describes a group of copper images which the king himself had set up. The central image was Dakshiṇâmûrti with four arms seated on a mountain. The latter had two peaks on which there were two Kinnaras and two Kinnaris. Under the foot of the god was Muśalagaṉ. On the mountain were four *rishis*, a snake, two *karṇaprâvritas* and a tiger. A baniyan tree was also on the mountain and had nine main branches and forty-two minor ones. A wallet was suspended from the tree and a bunch of peacock's feathers was one of the accompaniments of the god.

The four *rishis* on the mountain are Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanâtana and Sanatkumâra, the four sons of god Brahmâ. In order to expound the mysteries of the Vêdas to these four *rishis* the god Śiva is said to have assumed the form of Dakshiṇâmûrti. In fact

---

[1] According to one of the Śaiva legends it was the god Vishṇu himself that became a bull (*rishabha*) for Śiva to ride upon when the latter had to fight against the demon Tripura. In one of the sculptures of the Seven Pagodas (*Cave temples of India*, p. 147) is a representation of Ṛishabhavâhanadêva. Here Śiva and Pârvatî are seated on a couch each of them resting one of the legs on the back of a bull which is lying down. Pârvatî has Subrahmaṇya on her knee. Behind them is seen a figure of the god Vishṇu to the right and one of Brahmâ to the left. Behind the bull is a seated woman. A parasol is held over the head of Pârvatî. It is not impossible that this group represents the usual Sômâskanda in which, as the name denotes, the images of Śiva, Umâ (Pârvatî) and Skanda appear. The bull, however, is not generally seen in representations of Sômâskanda.

[2] Muyalagaṉ or Muśalagaṉ (known in Sanskṛit as Apasmâra) is the name of a black dwarf who issued out of the sacrificial fire of the *rishis* of the Dârukâvana forest. The sacrifices were offered in order to discomfit Śiva; and Śiva came there to teach them a lesson. A fierce tiger and a monstrous serpent issued out of the fire one after the other and were quickly overcome by the god. Muyalagaṉ appeared next. His form was hideous and malignant and he brandished a club with eyes of fire. Śiva pressed the tip of his foot and broke Muyalagaṉ's back so that he writhed on the ground. With this last foe prostrate Śiva resumed the dance of which all the gods were witnesses. This is why Muyalagaṉ is represented as lying under the feet of Śiva. He is also found under the feet of Chaṇḍêśvaraprasâdadêva, Dakshiṇâmûrti and Tañjai-Aṛagar. Muyalagaṉ is also described as a kind of disease from which a woman of Pâchchilâchchiramam was suffering. She was cured by the saint Tirujñânasambandar according to the *Periyapurâṇam*.

Dakshiṇâmûrti is the god Śiva in his capacity as a spiritual teacher.[1] Two aspects of Dakshiṇâmûrti are described, *viz.*, Yôga-Dakshiṇâmûrti and Vîṇâ-Dakshiṇâmûrti. The following verse exemplifies the popular belief in Dakshiṇâmûrti as a teacher :

नित्यशो दाक्षिणामूर्त्तिं ध्यायेत्साधकसत्तमः ।
शास्त्रव्याख्यानसामर्थ्यं लभते वत्सरान्तरे ॥

In South Indian temples at present Dakshiṇâmûrti occupies a niche on the south wall of the central shrine with a stone structure in front of it. In the old ones, however, the niche appears to have remained alone without any clumsy addition made to it. For instance, in the Râjarâjêśvara temple there is a niche to Dakshiṇâmûrti on the south wall. But the structure in front of this niche covers one or two sections of an inscription of Râjarâja (No. 4). It is therefore clear that, though Dakshiṇâmûrti was worshipped in the beginning of the 11th century A.D., the practice of raising up a special structure for him had not yet come into vogue. It is also worthy of note that all the foregoing accompaniments are not found in the sculptures of Dakshiṇâmûrti which we now find in Śiva temples.

Queen Prithvîmahâdêvî set up a seated image of Śrîkaṇṭhamûrtigaḷ with four arms (No. 80). The god Śiva got this name in consequence of his swallowing the *hâlâhala* poison produced at the churning of the ocean. The name Nîlakaṇṭha of the god is also traceable to the same event.[2] An image of Pâśupatamûrti was set up by queen Iḷâḍamahâdêvî. The details are however not given. In fact her setting up the image is only incidentally referred to in No. 95 below. The scene relates to the gift of the *pâśupata*-weapon to the Pâṇḍava prince Arjuna for use in battle against Jayadratha.[3] An image of Chandraśêkharadêva is said to have been set up by Râjarâja (No. 54). In this case too the details

---

[1] The following verse gives a description of Dakshiṇâmûrti :—

प्रोद्यच्छाखमहावटद्रुमतले योगासनस्थं प्रभुम्
प्रत्यक्तत्त्वबुभुत्सुभिः प्रतिदिशं प्रोद्वीक्ष्यमाणाननम् ।
मुद्रां तर्कमयीं दधानममलं कर्पूरगौरं शिवम्
हृद्यन्तः कलये स्फुरन्तमनिशं श्रीदाक्षिणामूर्त्तिकम् ॥

Hêmâdri in his *Vratakhaṇḍa* has :—

दक्षेण मुद्रां प्रतिपादयन्तं
सिताक्षसूत्रं च तथोर्द्ध्वभागे ।
वामे च पुस्तामखिलागमाद्यां
बिभ्राणमूर्द्ध्वेन सुधाधरं च ॥

सिताम्बुजस्थं सितवर्णमीशं
सिताम्बरालेपनमिन्दुमौलिम् ।
ज्ञानं मुनिभ्यः प्रतिपादयन्तं
तं दक्षिणामूर्तिमुदाहरन्तम् ॥

The *Kâraṇâgama* supplies the following information :—

नारदो जमदग्निश्च वसिष्ठभृगुदक्षिणे ।
भरद्वाजश्शौनकश्चाप्यगस्त्यो भार्गवस्तथा ॥
वामभागे विधातव्याः किन्नराद्यैस्सुसेविते ।
कैलासपर्वते तस्मिन्वटवृक्षस्य मूलके ॥

आसीनं सकलेशं तं शांतरूपं महेश्वरम्।
दक्षिणामूर्तिमित्युक्तं ॥
अधोऽपस्मारं शाययेत् ॥

[2] Vishâpaharamûrti, 'the swallower of poison' is described in the *Kâraṇâgama* to have one face, three eyes, braided hair and four arms holding in the two upper ones the antelope and the axe. He is in the posture of drinking the poison which he holds in his right (lower) hand. On his left side is the goddess with two arms. With her right arm stretched round the neck of Śiva she shows anxiety in her face.

[3] In the *Kâśyapa-Śilpa*, a chapter of the *Aṁśumat-Tantra*, Pâśupatamûrti is thus described :—

त्रिणेत्रं चतुर्भुजं सौम्यमूर्ध्वकेशं महातनुम् ।
अभयं शूलहस्तं च दक्षिणे तु करद्वये ॥
वरदं चाक्षमाला च हि(वा)मपार्श्वे करद्वये ।
प्रवाळसदृशप्रख्यं सौम्यनेत्रांतशीतलम् ॥

सर्वाभरणसंयुक्तं किंचित्प्रहासिताननम् ।
शूलं त्वधोमुखं धृत्वा कपालं वरदे धृतम् ॥
*   *   *   *
रौद्रं पाशुपतं ह्येतद्वाले(ण?)ालेर्गं तु पूजितम् ।

This description shows that Pâśupatamûrti is not connected with the gift of the *pâśupata*-weapon to Arjuna.

are not mentioned.[1] According to Śaiva legends the god Śiva came to wear the crescent on his head as the moon prayed for release from the curse of his father-in-law Daksha that he should gradually dwindle day by day and eventually die.

Seven images of Gaṇapati[2] are said to have been set up by the king, two in the dancing posture, three seated comfortably and the remaining two, standing (No. 84). With one of the second three, there was a tree. In describing gifts to Gaṇapati two separate forms are mentioned, *viz.*, Âlaiyattu-Piḷḷaiyâr and Parivâralaiyattu-Piḷḷaiyâr. The former was probably in the central shrine and the latter in the enclosure hall. According to the *Śaṁkaravijaya* the Gâṇâpatya sect was sub-divided into six sub-sects who worshipped six different forms of the god, *viz.*, Mahâ-Gaṇapati, Haridrâ-Gaṇapati, Uchchhishṭa-Gaṇapati (also called Hêramba-Gaṇapati), Navanîta-Gaṇapati, Svarṇa-Gaṇapati and Santâna-Gaṇapati.[3] A Tamil book entitled *Śirpachintâmaṇi* describes twelve kinds of Gaṇapati, *viz.*, Bâla-Gaṇapati, Dhanur-Gaṇapati, Bhakti-Gaṇapati, Vîra-Gaṇapati, Piṅgala-Gaṇapati, Uchchhishṭa-Gaṇapati, Kshipare (Kshipra ?)-Gaṇapati, Êrâpâśa (Hêramba ?)-Gaṇapati, Lakshmî-Gaṇapati, Mahâ-Gaṇapati, Bhuvana-Gaṇapati and Nirttana (Nṛitta)-Gaṇapati. These varieties[4] are due probably to the fact that he is a popular deity. His

---

[1] The *Kâraṇâgama* says of him :—

अभयवरदहस्तं सौम्यशृंगारभावं
विपुलवरदनेत्रं चंद्रबिंबांशमौलिम् ।
ऋजुतनुसमपादस्थानकं विद्रुमाभं
हरिणपरशुपाणिं पद्मपीठोपरिष्ठम् ॥

[2] Kâśyapa quoted by Bhaṭṭôtpala in his commentary on the *Bṛihatsaṁhitâ* describes Gaṇapati—Vinâyaka as follows :—

एकदंष्ट्रो गजमुखश्चतुर्बाहुर्विनायकः ।
लम्बोदरः स्थूलदेहो नेत्रत्रयविभूषितः ॥

Hêmâdri in his *Vratakhaṇḍa* has :—

विनायकस्तु कर्त्तव्यो गजवक्त्रश्चतुर्भुजः ।
स्थलकश्चाक्षमाला च तस्य दक्षिणहस्तयोः ॥
पात्रश्चोदकपूर्णश्च परशुश्चैव वामतः ।
दन्तश्चास्य न कर्त्तव्यो वामे रिपुनिषूदन ॥

पादपीठकृतः पाद एक आसनगो भवेत् ।
पूर्णे चोदकपात्रे च कराग्रन्तस्य कारयेत् ॥
लम्बोदरस्तथा कार्य्यस्तच्च (?) कर्णश्च.यादव ।
व्याघ्रचर्माम्बरधरः सर्पयज्ञोपवीतवान् ॥

In the translation of the *Bṛihatsaṁhitâ* by Mr. N. Chidambara Aiyar (Madura, 1884), Part II, Ch. 11, verse 57, the following occurs :

"The image of Gaṇêsa shall be represented with the face of the elephant, with a hanging belly, with an axe in his hand, with a single tusk and with the root of the Mulaka with its black leaves." I do not find this verse in the Vizianagram Sanskrit Series edition of the *Bṛihatsaṁhitâ*. Vighnêśvara is represented in a sitting posture, with a big belly. His head is that of an elephant, and on it he wears a crown, while his ears are adorned with two flowers and two jewels, and his forehead with sacred ashes. Of his four arms he lifts two up, holding in the left hand the *pâśa* (*i.e.*, a rope) and in the right a *kuṭhâra* (*i.e.*, an elephant goad). In the right of his other two hands he holds a piece of his own elephant's tooth, which he once broke in a rage, and in the left a pancake, for he is said to be fond of pancakes. Round his neck he wears necklaces of pearls and precious stones, and likewise on his arms and feet, and from his shoulders a garland hangs down.

[3] *Religious Thought and Life in India* by Mon. Williams, p. 217 f.

[4] The *Mudgala-purâṇa* mentions 32 forms of Gaṇapati :—

बालस्तरुणभक्तौ च वीरः शक्तिर्द्विजस्तथा ।
सिद्ध उच्छिष्टविघ्नेशौ क्षिप्रो हेरंबनामकः ॥
लक्ष्मीगणपतिश्चैव महाविघ्नेश्वरस्तथा ।
विजयः कल्पनृत्तश्चाप्यूर्ध्वविघ्नेश उच्यते ॥

एकाक्षरो वरश्चैव त्र्यक्षरः क्षिप्रदायकः ।
हरिद्राख्यश्चैकदंतःसृष्टिरुद्दंडनामकः ॥
ऋणमोचनको ढुंढिर्द्विमुखस्त्रिमुखस्तथा ।
सिंहो योगश्च दुर्गा च देवः संकटहारकः ॥

The only Gaṇapati here who is connected with a tree is कल्पनृत्तगणपति, *i.e.*, Gaṇapati dancing under the Kalpa-tree. In the inscription No. 84, however, Gaṇapati who is associated with a shrub (tree) (p. 407 below) is comfortably seated, not dancing.

image is found not only within all Śaiva temples but also in front of temples and even in the streets. He is also worshipped in the majority of Śûdra houses in the Tamil country. This fact is expressed in the following Sanskrit verse said to be extracted from the old version of Manu :—

विप्राणां दैवतं शंभुः क्षत्रियाणां तु माधवः ।
वैश्यानां तु भवेद् ब्रह्मा शूद्राणां गणनायकः ॥

How he came to be the remover of obstacles (Vighnêśvara) from his position as the commander of the celestial troops (gaṇapati), is a point on which no information is at present forthcoming.

The worship of the god Subrahmaṇya does not appear to have been so prevalent in ancient times as it is at the present day. His surnames Shaṇmukha, Skanda and Kârttikêya occur in Vêdic literature and there is also an Upanishad entitled Skanda-Upanishad. In the *Mahâbhârata* his origin from Agni is described and he is also known as Agnikumâra. Kumâra's birth is also briefly mentioned in the *Râmâyaṇa*. Kâlidâsa's poem *Kumârasambhava* is a description of the birth of the god Shaḍânana and of his achievements. He is the commander of the good demon armies and is also known as Sênâni. He leads his troops against the hosts of their enemies, the evil demons. It was probably this aspect of his nature that led to some of his temples being built on hills, *e.g.*, Tirupparaṅguṉṟam, Paṟani and Kuṉṉakkuḍi in the Madura district, Kaṟugumalai and Tiruchchendûr in the Tinnevelly district, Tiruttaṇi and Vaḷḷimalai in the North Arcot district and Svâmimalai in the Tanjore district. His temples are frequented by those who seek to be delivered from evil spirits or to obtain children. He is the patron saint of burglars and thieves as stated in the *Mṛichchhakaṭikâ*. Even now he is the deity adored by Kaḷḷars and Maravas who belong to the robber castes. He is also identified with the serpent in some mysterious way. This connection between the god Subrahmaṇya and the serpent probably arose at the village of Subrahmaṇya in the South Canara district where, according to Dr. Kittel, the god Kârttikêya was formerly worshipped. It is now a place of worship of the serpent Âdiśêsha. Besides, the name Subba or Subbarâya which is applied to the serpent is a *tadbhava* of the Sanskrit *śubhra*.[1] Owing probably to some mistake the word Subba or Subbarâya has been connected with the name Subrahmaṇya and the association of Kârttikêya with the serpent may be due to some such false etymology.

According to Varâhamihira's *Bṛihatsaṁhitâ* the image of Skanda should be made to appear young with the weapon known as *śakti* in his hand and mounted on a peacock.[2]

---

[1] The sixth *tithi* of the first fortnight is considered sacred both to Subbarâya and Skanda. The *Subbarâya-shashṭhi* is celebrated on the sixth day of the bright half of the month Mârgaśira when people pour milk, etc., into snake holes or offer presents to *brahmachârins* in the name of Subbarâya and take only one meal. Skanda-shashṭhi is the 6th of the bright half of Kârttika.

[2] This is the translation of Mr. Chidambara Aiyar. The text of the Vizianagram edition (ch. 57, vol. 41), has स्कन्दः कुमाररूपः शक्तिधरो बर्हिकेतुश्च.

Bhaṭṭôtpala in his commentary on the *Bṛihatsaṁhitâ* has :—

मयूरवाहनः स्कन्दः शक्तिकुक्कुटधारकः ।
सुरूपदेहो विक्रान्तो देवः सेनापतिः शिशुः ॥

In his *Vratakhaṇḍa*, Hêmâdri says :—

कुमारः षण्मुखः कार्य्यः शिखण्डकविभूषणः ।
रक्ताम्बरधरः कार्य्यो मयूरवरवाहनः ॥
कुक्कुटश्च तथा घण्टा तस्य दक्षिणहस्तयोः ।
पताका वैजयन्ती च शक्तिः कार्य्या च वामयोः ॥

In South-Indian temples Subrahmaṇya has six heads and twelve arms. Oftener he has one head and four arms only, of which two are lifted and hold the lance while the other two are empty. On his head he wears a crown. To his right and left stand his two wives Vallî and Devasênâ and near him is the peacock, his vehicle. The evolution of this god and his present attributes from the original conception of the celestial general, illustrates the way in which the Brâhmanical religion has been added to in course of time.

The Tamil work *Śirpachintâmaṇi* describes eight different forms of the god Subrahmaṇya, *viz.*, Jñânaśaktidhara, Daṇḍâyudhapâṇi, Sênâpati, Ârumugam (Skt. Shaḍânana), Śuppiramaṇiyar (Skt. Subrahmaṇya), Śaravaṇôṟpavar (Skt. Śaravaṇôdbhava), Kumâra, Shaṇmugaṉ (Skt. Shaṇmukha) and Târukâriyâṉ (Skt. Târakâri).[1] Another Tamil work entitled *Śuppiramaṇiya-parâkkiramam* describes eighty-eight different feats of the god and the forms assumed by him on each of those occasions.

Only a single image of the god Subrahmaṇyadêva was set up by the king in the Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore. He had only four arms and apparently a single head (No. 49). Even the epithet *piḷḷaiyâr* which is prefixed in the case of the god Gaṇapati is omitted here.

The Kadambas are represented as meditating on the god Svâmi-Mahâsêna, *i.e.*, Kârttikêya and Mayûraśarman, the first king of that dynasty, is said to have been anointed, by Shaḍânana.[2] The Chalukyas of Bâdâmi also meditated on the feet of the god Mahâsêna.

In the Timmâpuram plates of the first Eastern Chalukya king Vishṇuvardhana I, the Chalukyas are described as "having been rendered prosperous by Mahâsêna, who by his own arm had defeated the great army of the sons of Danu"[3]. In the Kailâsanâtha temple inscription of the Pallava king Râjasiṁha the king is compared to the god Guha also called Kumâra and Subrahmaṇya. The weapon *śakti* (lance) is also referred to here. The earliest epigraphical reference to a temple of the god Subrahmaṇya occurs in a Pallava inscription of Nandivarman at Mallam in the Nellore district (called Tiruvânbûr in the inscription).[4] In the early Tamil poem *Tiṟumurugâṟṟuppaḍai* six places sacred to the god are mentioned, *viz.*, Tirupparaṅguṉṟam, Tiruchchîralaivây, Tiruvâviṉaṉkuḍi, Tiruvêragam, Kuṉṟutôrâḍal and Paṟamudirśôlai. Modern temples dedicated to the god are found also at Tirupporûr in the Chingleput district, Puḷḷirukku-Vêḷûr (Vaidîsvarankôyil) in the Tanjore district, Sandur in the Bellary district[5] and Kataragama in Ceylon.[6] Tirupparaṅguṉṟam and Puḷḷirukku-Vêḷûr are also mentioned in the *Dêvâram*. But there is nothing to show that there were Subrahmaṇya shrines in those two places at the time when the *Dêvâram* hymns were composed.

---

[1] The *Śaivâgamaśêkhara* mentions seventeen forms of Subrahmaṇya, viz., (1) Jñânaśakti, (2) Skanda, (3) Agnijâta, (4) Saurabhêya, (5) Gâṅgêya, (6) Śaravaṇôdbhava, (7) Kârttikêya, (8) Kumâra, (9) Shaṇmukha, (10) Târakâri, (11) Sênâni, (12) Guha, (13) Brahmachâri, (14) Dêśika, (15) Krauñchabhêdana, (16) Śikhivâhana and (17) Vêlâyudha.

[2] *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 287, foot-note 1.

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 319.

[4] *Nellore Inscriptions*, Gûḍûr, 54. A record of the early [Gaṅga]-Pallava king Narasiṁhavarman from Kîṟ-Muṭṭugûr (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IV, p. 178) records a gift to a worshipper of Shâṇmâtura (Kârttikêya).

[5] The village Subrahmaṇya in the South Canara district is also mentioned among villages sacred to the god Subrahmaṇya. According to Mr. Sewell the principal objects of worship in the temple are two images of a *Nâga* and a six-faced deity which stand side by side in the *garbhagṛiha*. But Dr. Kittel says Subrahmaṇya was originally a place for the worship of Skanda but has now become dedicated to serpent worship.

[6] Parker's *Ancient Ceylon*, p. 115.

The other names of the god Subrahmaṇya are Muruga, Ârumugam (Shaḍânana in Sanskṛit), Skanda, Kumâra, Vêlâyudha, Sênâpati and Kârttikêya. It seems to me that Muruga is not a new name but only a Tamil translation of the Sanskṛit designation Kumâra. There is no reason to suppose that Muruga was an ancient Dravidian god afterwards assimilated with Skanda. The earliest references in Tamil literature to this god support the view that Muruga is only a Tamil rendering of the Sanskṛit Kumâra.

In the ancient Tamil poem *Maṇimêgalai* the god Muruga is described as the son of Śiva and as having subdued the mountain Kiravuñjagiri (Skt. Krauñchagiri). In another ancient poem entitled *Tirumurugâṟṟuppaḍai* he is described as having six faces and twelve arms. His consorts are referred to here and one of them, *viz.*, Valli is actually mentioned by name. The peacock is also referred to as his vehicle and the cock as his banner. His priest carried a lance and was called *vêlaṉ* or lancer. On festive occasions a bull was sacrificed to the god and boiled rice mixed with its warm blood, was offered.

There are various legends about the origin of the god Skanda.[1] But the original conception is apparently Sênâni or Mahâsêna, the general of the celestial armies. From this original idea was evolved Kârttikêya, as the month of Kârttika is best fitted for war. The name Kârttikêya naturally came to be connected with the six Kṛittikas and he was looked upon as the son of all six of them. Six faces came to be associated with his figure by a natural sequence of ideas and then twelve arms came to be attributed to him. As he was the god of war he became the object of worship for reigning kings and families like the Kadambas and Chalukyas.

Two more images require to be noticed before we pass on to the next section. The first is that of god Vishṇu set up by the king himself (No. 52) and called Mahâvishṇukkal. The image had four arms.[2] No further details are furnished. But the fact shows that the king was no bigot, though he was a staunch Śaiva.[3] The second image to which I wish to invite attention here is that of Sûrya, the sun-god. The image was one cubit (*muṛam*) and two *viral* in height and had two arms. It was set up by an officer of the king (No. 56) who presented a garland of rays to it. There is no reference to the seven horses which are represented as drawing his chariot.[4] Neither are they mentioned in the *Brihat-*

---

[1] According to one legend he was the son of Śiva without the intervention of Pârvatî, the god's generative energy, being cast into the fire and then received by the Ganges. Hence Kumâra is sometimes described as the son of Agni and Gaṅgâ. When born, he was fostered by the six Kṛittikas and these offering their six breasts to the child he became six-headed.

[2] Images of the god Vishṇu may have 8, 4 or 2 arms. With the mole known as *Śrîvatsa* on the breast and the gem *Kaustubha* the body should be of the colour of the *atasi*-flower and the cloth yellow. The countenance should be cheerful and the image should wear pendants and a crown. The neck, shoulders and arms should be large. Three of the right hands should hold a sword, a club and an arrow respectively and the fourth shall appear stretched and held vertically in the attitude of offering protection. The four left hands should hold the bow, the target, the discus and the conch. If the image has only four arms, one of the two right hands should hold the club and the other raised as *abhaya-hasta*. The two left hands hold the conch and the discus. If the image has only two hands, one of them is the *abhaya-hasta*, while the other holds the conch (*Bṛihatsaṁhitâ*, chapter II, verses 31 to 35).

[3] No. 91 refers to three images of Śrî-Vâsudêva presented to the temple by king Râjarâja.

[4] Sûrya is identical with Savitṛi, Ravi and Âditya, although these personifications are often distinguished from one another. He is the regent or guardian of the south-west quarter. He is generally represented as a ruddy man, seated on a lotus in a chariot drawn by either seven horses or a seven-headed horse, with the legless Aruṇa for his charioteer. He is surrounded by a halo or circle of light. In two hands he holds a water-lily; with the third he is forbidding fear, and with the fourth bestowing blessings. There is a temple dedicated to the Sun at Baroda in Gujarat where he is known as Sûrya-Nârâyaṇa. The *Makara-saṁkrânti* and *Ratha-saptami* are the days on which he is specially worshipped; Birdwood's *Industrial Arts of India*, p. 67.

saṁhitâ[1] or Hêmâdri's *Chaturvargachintâmaṇi*.[2] The earliest sculptures of the god so far found in Northern India contain four horses.[3]

As I have pointed out elsewhere[4] the worship of Sûrya was probably introduced into the Tamil country from Northern India. The first temple dedicated to Sûrya in the Chôla country was built apparently during the reign of Kulôttuṅga I when, there was some intercourse between the sun-worshipping Gahaḍavâlas of Kanauj and the Chôḷas of Tanjore.

Of greater importance than the foregoing are the images of cannonised Śaiva saints set up in the temple. One of them we owe to the king himself and the others to the religious devotion of the manager of the Râjarâjêśvara temple. The first group (No. 29) consisted of (1) Chaṇḍêśvaraprasâdadêva with four arms; (2) Muśalagaṉ with two arms; (3) Umâparamêśvarî; (4) Mahâdêva (*i.e.*, a *liṅga*) from which an arm was projecting; (5) Chaṇḍêśvara with two arms; (6) his father with two arms represented as having fallen down and lying on the ground; (7) Chaṇḍêśvara having two arms represented as receiving a boon; and (8) a flower garland given to him as a boon. The events of Chaṇḍêśvara's life represented in the foregoing groups are preserved to us in the Tamil *Periyapurâṇam* with the exception of a single item. Why a divine arm was projecting from the *liṅga* is not apparent. The part that the arm played in the story is altogether missing in the *Periyapurâṇam*. Another image of Chaṇḍêśvara was set up by an officer of the king (No. 55). The image had two arms and held an axe (*maṟu*). This is the usual representation of the Chaṇḍêśvara in Śiva temples. Chaṇḍêśvara is said in the *Periyapurâṇam* to have been made the chief of Śaiva devotees by the god Śiva. In epigraphical records all transactions connected with Śiva temples are represented as having been made in the name of Chaṇḍêśvara. In the case of endowments made to Śiva temples the documents used to be drawn up in the name of Chaṇḍêśvara. If any land belonging to the temple had to be sold, Chaṇḍêśvara is stated to have accepted the price of the land paid by the purchaser. In fact he was looked upon as the manager of the temple. This office Chaṇḍêśvara may be considered to hold even to this day. Any worshipper visiting a Śiva temple has to appear at the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine before leaving the temple premises and clap his hands evidently to satisfy the god that he is not taking away any temple property with him.

The manager of the Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara temple towards the close of Râjarâja's reign and during the early years of Râjêndra-Chôḷa's reign was Âdittaṉ Sûryaṉ *alias* Teṉṉavaṉ Mûvêndavêḷâṉ, a headman of Poygai-nâḍu. In the second year of Râjêndra-Chôḷa's reign (A.D. 1013-14) he presented several gilt copper-pots to be placed on the shrine of Chaṇḍêśvara (No. 60). This gift alone would not have entitled him to our gratitude. Before the close of the twenty-ninth year of Râjarâja (A.D. 1013-14) Âdittaṉ Sûryaṉ set up images of Nambi Ârûraṉâr, Naṅgai-Paravaiyâr, Tirunâvukkaraiyar, Tiruñânaśambandaḍigaḷ, Periya-Perumâḷ, his consort Olôgamâdêviyâr, *i.e.*, Lôkamahâdêvî and Chandraśêkharadêvar worshipped by Periya-Perumâḷ (No. 38). During the next year (*i.e.*, A.D. 1014-15) he made gifts to the images of Nambi-Ârûraṉâr, Tiruñânaśambandaḍigaḷ, Tirunâvukkaraiyar and Periya-Perumâḷ (No. 41). He also

---

[1] The sun shall be represented as holding a lotus in each hand, as wearing a crown and pendants, with garlands hanging from his neck and as surrounded by gods. The face shall be bright as the lotus. The body shall be covered with stitched coats; the countenance shall be cheerful and the lustre of the gems shall add beauty to the image (*Bṛihatsaṁhitâ*, chapter II, verses 47-8).

[2] *Dânakhaṇḍa* (chapter II, p. 757 f.) mentions the *ratha*, but not the horses.

[3] See Dr. Vogel's *Progress Report* for 1909-10, p. 8.

[4] *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1890, Part II, paragraph 60.

set up an image of the king of Milâḍu who had said *Tattâ namarê kâṉ*, *i.e.*, the Śaiva devotee Meypporu-Ṉâyaṉâr (No. 40).[1] In the same year he set up another group of images illustrating the life of Śiruttoṇḍa-Nâyaṉâr (No. 43). These were (1) Kshêtrapâladêvar with eight arms; (2) Bhairava-mûrtigaḷ with two arms; (3) Śiṟuttoṇḍa-Nambi with two arms; (4) Tiru-veṉkâṭṭu-Naṅgai; and (5) Śîrâladêvar. In the *Periyapurâṇam* version of Śiṟuttoṇḍar's life, Kshêtrapâla plays no part. It is only Bhairava that appears. Again in the name of Meypporu-Ṉâyaṉâr there is a slight difference between the form of it given in the Tanjore inscription and that found in the *Periyapurâṇam*. Dr. Hultzsch thinks that by Periya-Perumâḷ, Râjarâja himself is meant and that Olôgamahâdêvî was his queen Lôkamahâdêvî. This seems to be very likely and both of them were probably dead at the time the images were actually set up. The fact that the images of the Śaiva devotees noted above had been installed during the early years of the eleventh century A.D. is of very great importance for the history of Tamil literature. Dr. Hultzsch has pointed out its importance and consequently there is no necessity to repeat his statements.

Of Śakti deities (*grâmadêvatâ*), very few images are mentioned as having been established in the Tanjore temple. No. 81 records the setting up of a seated image of Kâḷâ-Piḍâri with four arms, and No. 79 of Durgâ-Paramêśvarî with four arms. In the suburbs of Tanjore there was evidently a pretty big temple of Raudra-Mahâkâḷam dedicated perhaps to Rudra-Mahâkâḷa, one of the errible forms of Śiva (No. 64, paragraph 4). Among the villages whose revenues were assigned to the Râjarâjêśvara temple, a number of village deities and their shrines are incidentally referred to. These are Aiyaṉ,[3]

---

[1] An earlier reference to Milâḍuḍaiyâr, *i.e.*, Meypporu-Ṉâyaṉâr is in an inscription from Tirunâgêś-varam which belongs to the time of Râjakêsarivarman, probably, Âditya I. (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1912, Part II, paragraph 12).

[2] The life of Śiṟuttoṇḍa is intimately connected with the temple at Tiruchcheṅgâṭṭâṅguḍi in the Tanjore district; *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, Part II, paragraph 7.

[3] The chief male deity among the *grâmadêvatos* is Aiyaṉ or Aiyaṉâr. He is also named Ariyaraputtiraṉ (Hariharaputra), *i.e.*, Vishṇu-Śiva's son, because he is said to owe his origin to the union of Śiva with Vishṇu, when the latter took the female form called Môhinî. Aiyaṉâr is represented by a human form in a sitting posture, with a red skin, a crown on his head and pearls in his locks. On his forehead, he wears the sacred ashes, pearls on his ears and neck and a sort of ribbon on his breast. The arms, hands, feet and the whole body are full of jewels and ornaments. In his right hand he holds a ceptre, to indicate that he is the chief among village gods. Round his body and his left leg he wears a kind of belt called *bâhuppaḍai* which is also used by sages and others when they sit. From his shoulders, garlands hang down. The upper part of his body is uncovered whilst the lower is covered with a motley garment.

Aiyaṉâr's two wives, *viz.*, Pûraṇai (on the right) and Puṭkalai (on the left) are represented as having, natural bodies of a yellow colour with crowns on their heads and flowers in their hands. Pûraṇai wears on her forehead the mark of musk *kastûri* and Puṭkalai the sacred ashes. The temples of Aiyaṉâr stand usually at some distance west of villages in a grove. At the entrance stand two door keepers with crowns on their heads, thick clubs in their hands and lion's teeth in their mouth. In the first apartment stand seven small figures of the Sapta-Mâtris and two of Vighnêśvara. In the inner apartment is Aiyaṉâr with his two wives and round about them stand seven figures of stone representing virgins which are however not worshipped. In front of the temple is an altar of stone for animal sacrifices. Close by the temple on both sides of it are figures of clay among which are Aiyaṉâr's generals called *pâḷaiyakkârar*. These figures are presented by the devotees in fulfilment of vows. Aiyaṉâr is worshipped as Śâstâ in Malabar. Aiyaṉâr is never asked for any positive good. He only protects from harm and his worship consists solely in propitiation. Like Gaṇêśa and Skanda, the popular deity Aiyaṉâr is a lord and leader of the demon host and his province is to guard the fields, crops and herds of the peasantry and drive away their enemies, the devils and fends who are ever on the alert to inflict disease, blight and other calamities. Accordingly outside every village in Southern India, may be seen the shrine of Aiyaṉâr, surrounded with rude clay or terra-cotta